

**The role of the nobility during early Turkish
rule in India, 1210 - 1266**

by

**K.G.Asghar, B.A.Hons, (Calcutta); M.A.International
Relations (Dacca); M.A.History (Dacca);
L.L.B. (Dacca)**

**Thesis presented for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
University of Edinburgh,
Faculty of Arts**

March 1969



PREFACE

The history of the kings and royal dynasties of the region have received the attention of historians. The Turkish nobility, who were the real founders of the Muslim kingdom, and were an essential part of the administration, have failed to attract the attention of scholars up until now. Inadequate original material for its study may be said to account for the lack of interest. It could hardly be denied that a study of this particular class - their composition, traditions, role in administration and society - is extremely important to understand correctly this most fascinating period which marked the establishment of Muslim rule in India.

I owe a deep debt of gratitude to my teacher and supervisor, Mr. J. R. Walsh, for the numerous helpful suggestions and ideas I received from him during my stay at Edinburgh. In fact, this work would never have seen the light of day without his help and guidance. His stimulating discourses of basic historical problems were always a source of inspiration to me which made my task considerably easy. He took personal interest in my welfare, and has been more than a teacher to me. I am also indebted to Professor W. M. Watt for his keen interest in my papers in his seminars.

I am also grateful to Dr. M. O. Ghani, Vice-Chancellor, University of Dacca, for providing me the opportunity of preparing this work. Nor can I fail to thank Professor M. Kabir, Head of the Department of History, University of Dacca, who ungrudgingly spared me for the period I stayed at Edinburgh, in spite of his heavy pressure

of work. My thanks are also due to my colleague, Dr. M.M. 'Alī, Reader in History, University of Dacca, who suggested to me to work on this unexplored field.

NOTES ON TRANSLITERATION

The transliteration of Arabic and Persian letters is essentially that of the second edition of the Encyclopaedia of Islam. There have, however, been two modifications in order to accommodate the text to the traditional spellings used in the histories of Islamic India. q has been used instead of k, and j for dj.

Vowel signs (short vowels) = a, i, u.

Long vowels = ā, ī, ū.

In the present work, three rulers appear to have the common name, 'Mu'izz ud-Dīn'. In order to distinguish them, the following system has been adopted. The ruler of Ghazna, is written as 'Mu'izz al-Dīn', the son of Iletmish, is written as 'Mu'izz ud-Dīn', 'Mu'izz ud-Dīn Bahrām' or simply 'Bahrām', and the grandson of Balban, the son of Bughrā Khān, is invariably written as Mu'izz ud-Dīn Kaiqubād.

ABBREVIATIONS

'Afif	Tārīkh-i Fīrūzshāhī by Shams Sirāj-i 'Afif
Badāyūnī	Muntakhab ut-tawārīkh by 'Abdul Qādir Badayunī
Baranī	Tārīkh-i Fīrūzshāhī by Dīya ud-Dīn Baranī
'Isāmī	Futuh us Salāṭīn (Pen-name 'Isāmī, real name not mentioned in the work)
T.A.	Tabaqāt-i Akbarī by Nizām ud-Dīn Ahmad
T.N.	Tabaqat-i Nāsiri by Minhāj

Institutions and Series

B.M.	British Museum (London)
G.M.S.	E.J.W. Gibb Memorial Series (London)
I.O.	India Office (London)

CONTENTS

Preface	2
Note on Transliteration	4
Abbreviations	5
Introduction	8
CHAPTER I	
The Slave System in Islamic Administration	21
The Palace Training of Pages	32
CHAPTER II	
The Palace Hierarchy and the Religious Institutions	37
A	
The Sultān	37
B	
The Court Officials	45
1	
Senior officials	45
(a) <u>Nā'ib-i mulk</u>	45
(b) <u>Wakil-i dar</u>	46
(c) <u>Amīr-i hajib</u>	48
(d) <u>Sar-i iandar</u>	50
(e) <u>Amīr-i majlis</u>	51
(f) <u>Amīr-i shikar</u>	52
(g) <u>Amīr-i akhur</u>	54
2	
Junior officials	
(a) <u>Chashnigir</u>	56
(b) <u>Shurbdar</u>	57
(c) <u>Sāqi-i khas</u>	57
(d) <u>Silāhdar</u>	58
C	
Religious officers	59
(a) <u>Shaikh ul Islam</u>	59
(b) <u>Sadr us sudur</u>	60
(c) <u>Qadi</u>	60
CHAPTER III	
The Post-Ghaznavid Period in Muslim India	63
A	
Political History to 1210 A.D.	63
B	
The Delhi Sultanate	90
CHAPTER IV	
The Classes and offices of the Nobility	129
CHAPTER V	
The Nobles and the Succession of the Sultāns	179

CHAPTER VI	Social and Cultural life of the Nobles	194
Conclusion		231
Appendices		
	A Amir Ruḥānis Verses on the Conquest of Ranthambor and Siwālik	244
	B Rubā'ī Recording the Date of the Conquest of Gwāliyūr	245
	C Cultural prosperity during the reign of Iletmish	246
Bibliography		247
Map:	Delhi Sultanate at the death of Iletmish (April 1236 A.D.)	

INTRODUCTION

The first Muslim attack on India was initiated by the Arabs under Muhammad bin Qāsim, in the early eighth century (712 A.D.). Politically its effects were confined to a small portion of India, particularly its western boundaries. Three centuries later (c.1000 A.D.), Mahmūd of Ghazna commenced his military operations against India and shattered the military might of its princes. He had no intention of establishing an Islamic Empire in the heart of India. The development of Ghazna with Indian wealth was his main objective. It was only a question of time for the age-old Indian political structure to collapse.

Towards the end of the twelfth century, Turkish adventurers under Mu'izz al-Din of Ghor commenced their attacks on northern India. Their success made them rulers of the territory. The Sultān became the de facto head of the state and the military nobility formed the ruling class. The Sultān could maintain his pre-eminence and leadership but was to remain careful that he did not do anything which incurred the displeasure of this influential group of nobles, as it would inevitably cost him the Crown.

His kingdom was a part of the caliphate; he was himself an agent of Islam, whose duty was to spread the Islamic faith and encourage the maintenance of the Muslim way of life. Often before a battle commenced, the offer to accept Islām was made. Every war was ultimately waged for the sake of religion, and each victory was

supposed to have added to the glory of Islam. The converted Turks with their fierce fanaticism, in less than two decades, carried all before them from the Siwālik to Bengal. Immediately after the military activities which established Muslim rule, they became materialistic in outlook. Military purposes having apparently been achieved, a desire for power and wealth overwhelmed them. Their loyalty to the ruler became questionable; the interplay of racial feelings and group interests divided them. Although such group interests tore them apart, the aim of preserving the Islamic kingdom was maintained. The unruly amirs and maliks, though always a threat to the existence of individual rulers, united when the existence of the state was threatened from outside, the uniting factor being the bond of religion.

For the early history of the Sultanate (1191-1218), Hasan¹ Nizāmī Nishāpurī's Taj ul ma'āthir is the first important authority. The author came to India in search of a career soon after the conquest of Delhi. The work deals mainly with the history of Qutb ud-Dīn, and also describes the campaigns of Mu'izz al-Dīn in northern India and a short account of the reign of Iltutmish till 1217/1218 A.D. A profuse display of rhetorics has been made in it, and the style of the book is extremely tedious. In trying to search for historical information, the reader has to turn page after page, going through superfluous descriptions and diversions before he could come across

1 LaOla Office 1486 (Ethe 209).

Extracts translated in Elliot and Dowson, History of India as told by its own historians, Vol. II.

something concerning history. This clearly diminishes the historical value of the work. Some of its information, such as the figures of the massacre of the Hindūs on the battlefield, and of their enslavement, are clearly exaggerated and cannot be accepted without question. With a few exceptions, the facts recorded are a truthful narration.

The Tārīkh-i Fakhṛ ud-Dīn Mubarak Shāh, written by Fakhṛ-i Mudabbir in the thirteenth century, and discovered and edited by Sir E. Dennison Ross¹, is a work of great value. It is wholly devoted to Qutb ud-Dīn and provides some additional information of his campaigns not recorded in any other contemporary text. It enables us to know the social and cultural background of the Turks and, also, their qualities, such as devotion to religion and their capacity to rise in life. Another work by the same author, Ādāb al mulūk wa kifāyat al mamlūk² is a treatise on the art of war and political administration. Though written in the thirteenth century it contains a large number of anecdotes relating to the Ghaznavids and gives little information about the Turkish Sultāns of Delhi. A third work by the same author, Ādāb ul Harb wa Sh ulā'at³ deals with the art of war and bravery. The last two works are dedicated to Iltutmish.

1 Edited by Sir E. Dennison Ross, litho, London 1927

2 In Oa Office 647 (Ethe 2767)

3 Rieu II, Add.16,853. This work with a different title has the same contents as the Ādāb al-mulūk wa kifāyat al mamlūk, but it has less chapters than the latter.

The Tabagāt-i-Nāsiri of Abū 'Umar Minhāj ud-Dīn Uthmān ibn-i Sirāj ud-Dīn al-Juzjānī, dedicated to Sultān Nāṣir ud-Dīn Mahmūd, the royal patron of the author, is a general history of Islām from the earliest times to 1260 A.D.¹ From 1228/1229, when Minhāj joined the Court of Iltutmish, till 1260 A.D., he was an eye-witness of all that happened in the Delhi Sultānate. He is the only authority for this period. His short sketches of the leading nobles are invaluable, as these help to know the various stages in the official hierarchy and, also, the internal condition of the Sultānate. For his information on the earlier period he often quotes his authority. He has arranged his work in chronological order and is generally correct in dates, but his treatment is not that of an impartial historian. Baranī's statement, "If I state anything which is contradictory to that master's (Minhāj's) writings, or concise or enlarge what he has stated, it will not only be disrespectful and rash, but would raise doubts and difficulties in the minds of his readers; I have therefore deemed it appropriate to exclude from this history everything that is included in the Tabagāt-i Nāsiri,² and to confine myself to the history of the later kings of Delhi," increases the suspicion of the veracity of Minhāj. He unceasingly tries to justify every activity of a particular faction, of which he

1 a) Rieu, I. Add. 26, 189

b) Persian text: Edited by Nassau Lees, Khādim Hussain and 'Abdul Hayy (Bib. Indica, Calcutta 1864). This is also a defective edition.

c) Edited by Chughtai, Lahore, 1952. It only contains an account of the Delhi Sultānate. The editing is not much up to expectation, otherwise it is a more complete copy.

d) All important details of the Delhi Sultāns are translated in Elliot and Dowson, History of India as told by its own historians, Vol. II.

2 Baranī, p. 21.

was obviously a member. This has led him to disfigure the reign of 'Alā ud-Dīn Mas'ūd by suppressing facts which would expose the undesirable activities of his patron, Balban. In view of the fact that he survived Nāsir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd and was a gadi¹ in the reign of Balban his abrupt ending of the Tabaqat Nāsirī is extremely disappointing.

The Tārīkh i-Firūz Shāhī of Dīyā ud-Dīn Baranī, written in the second half of the 14th century is an account of the Delhi Sultāns, commencing with the accession of Balban till the first six years of Firūz Tughlag's reign.² Baranī's ancestors held offices under the Sultāns of Delhi. He, himself was Muḥammad Tughlag's nadīm for about seventeen years. The information he collected from his ancestors, who are frequently cited, and his personal access to the Delhi Court, enabled him to correctly record the events of the reign he has covered. For details of administrative reforms and the campaigns, his work is valuable and reliable. He seldom gives dates even of campaigns and accessions and where he has done so, it is usually inaccurate. He was a sensitive writer, reacting strongly to anything he did not like. In describing the personal relationship of Qutb ud-Dīn Mubārak Khālji and Khusrāu Khān he goes to the extent of using foul language, unbecoming of a historian.

† Baranī, p.111

2 Rieu III, Or.2039

Persian text: Bib.Indica, edited by Sayyid Ahmed Khān, Calcutta 1862. The printed text, which is substantially identical with the manuscript has been extensively used.

All important facts are translated in Elliot and Dowson, History of India as told by its own historians, Vol.III.

The Tārīkh-i Firūz Shāhī of Shams Sirāj-i 'Afīf covers the
¹
 reign of Firūz Tughlaq. It gives valuable information of the administrative organization of the Sultanate, the condition of slaves, and the ruler's attitude towards them. It also describes the social, cultural and economic condition of the period. It is a systematic work, conforming largely to the modern standard of history writing. For the reign of Firūz Tughlaq it is most reliable, as the author was associated with the royal court and also attended the hunting parties of the Sultan.

The Futūḥāt-i Firūz Shāhī is said to have been written by
²
 Sultan Firūz Tughlaq himself. It contains eight folios. In spite of the small size it is a valuable document for the social and religious condition of the medieval period. It also helps us to know the liberal attitude of the early Muslim rulers towards the Hindus. The reforms of the Sultan for eradicating abuses from society are, also, embodied in it.

An extremely useful work composed in 1350 A.D. is the

1 Bib.Indica, edited by Maulavi Vilāyet Hussain, (Calcutta, 1891) Editing is extremely defective as pages have not been inserted in their proper place. Much of this work is translated in Elliot and Dowson, History of India as told by its own historians, Vol.III.

2 Rieu III, Or.2039. The entire work is translated in Elliot and Dowson, History of India as told by its own historians, Vol.III.

Futūh us salātīn of 'Iṣāmī¹. The author's real name is nowhere given in his work. It describes in verse the political history of India for over three hundred years from the rise of Maḥmūd of Ghazna to the reign of Muḥammad Tughlaq. It was composed at Daulatābād, away from the influence of the Delhī court. Additional information which has not been supplied by the contemporary chronicler is furnished in it. The way he has illustrated the intrigues of the Turkish nobility, before the deposition of every Sultān, is indeed classic. The source of his information for the Delhī Sultānate, was perhaps his aged grandfather, 'Izz ud-Dīn 'Iṣāmī, who had migrated with him in 1327 A. D. to Daulatābād. Unlike Minhāj and Baranī, he never cites an authority. Some of his information is inaccurate; mentioning Sultān Nāṣir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd as the grandson of Iletmish² (the posthumous son of Nāṣir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd), is absolutely incorrect. His treatment of some royal characters is uncharitable. His damaging language against Raḡīya and the entire women-folk is unpardonable. Nevertheless, its usefulness as an important document for the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries is unquestionable.

1 Printed text: Edited by Āghā Mehdī Hussain (Agra, 1938). It is a defective copy, most of its verses are missing in the manuscript, which is admitted by the author.

2 Futūh us Salātīn, p.140

1
The Jawāmi'ul Hikāyāt of Sadīd ud-Dīn Muḥammad 'Awfī

though a collection of anecdotes and stories, has much historical value. It helps to understand the literary and cultural climate of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Its preface contains details of Iletmish's military operations against Qubācha when the author was himself besieged in the fort of Bhakkar, with the latter. The work is dedicated to Iletmish's wazīr, Nizām ul mulk Junaidī.

The works of Amīr Khusrau (1253-1325 A.D.) are also an important source of information. The author was a contemporary of Baranī and his works, though non-historical, throw lurid light on the social and political conditions of the period. He passed his early life as the favourite courtier of Prince Muḥammad, the eldest son of Balban. He is said to have composed about half a million verses. The Qirān us sa'daīn² describes the historic meeting of Bughrā Khān with his son Mu'izz ud-Dīn Kaiqubād. The Nuh Sipihr³ relates the military campaigns of Quṭb ud-Dīn Mubārak Khaljī and also describes the cultural life of the period. The 'Ashīqa⁴ is a descriptive account of the romance of Dewal Rānī

1 a) Introduction to the Jawāmi'ul Hikāyāt of Muḥammad 'Awfī, Gibb Memorial Series (London, 1929).

b) extracts translated in Elliot and Dowson, History of India as told by its own historians, Vol.III

2 Litho, edited by Maulavī Qudrat Ahmed (Lucknow, 1885)

3 Litho, edited by M. Wahīd Mirzā (Calcutta, 1948)

4 a) Rieu, Or.335.

b) An abstract of the poem is given in Elliot and Dowson, History of India as told by its own historians, Vol.III.

the daughter of Rai Karan of Gujerāt, and Khidr Khān the son of 'Alā ud-Dīn Khaljī. In its preface, a brief history of the Sultāns of Delhī up to 'Alā ud-Dīn Khaljī is provided.. The Tārīkh-i 'Alāī¹ or Khazā'in ul Futūh¹ gives the history of the first fourteen years of 'Alā ud-Dīn's reign. It helps to know the mode of warfare during the period. The 'Ijāz-i-Khusravī² has great deal of historical importance. It contains letters and farmāns of the ruler, describing the administrative functions of the officials. The Matla'ul Anwār³ gives an access into the social condition of the period. Another useful contemporary work is the Fawā'id ul Fawā'id⁴ of Amīr Ḥasan 'Alā Sanjarī. Apparently it contains the talks of Nizām ud-Dīn Auliya, but has much historical value as it throws light on the religious attitude of the rulers and nobility of the 13th/14th centuries.

The accounts of travellers are also a very valuable source of history. The most important traveller who concerns our period was Ibn-i-Battūta. He visited India in 1333 A.D., and for eight years was the qādī of Delhī, and administrator of the

1 Litho., edited by M. Wahīd Mirzā (Calcutta, 1953)

2 Litho. (Lucknow, 1876)

3 Litho. (Lucknow, 1885)

4 I have used the Urdū translation by Malik Faḍl ud-Dīn Naqshbandī, Litho. (Karāchī, n.d.).

mausoleum of Qutb ud-Dīn Mubārak Khaljī. He provides much information on the important events of the period. For an insight into the judicial, political and military institutions, and the social and economic conditions and Court ceremonials, his work is extremely¹ useful. For the political history of the period preceding 1333 his information is open to question.

The accounts of al-Qalqashandī's Subh-ul a'shā fī sinā'at il inshā² and Ibn Faḍl ulla 'Umarī's Masālik ul Absār fi Mamālik i'l Amsār³ are prepared from the reports of various travellers and Indian Muslims living abroad. Although most of their details are exaggerated, they provide valuable information about the administrative organization and cultural life of the Sultānate.

Other travellers, such as Nicolo Conti and 'Abdur Razzāq,⁴ visited India in the fifteenth century and their accounts, though not directly concerned with the Delhi Sultānate, provide useful information about the cultural life of the country.

1 Ibn Battūta a) Abridged English translation by H.A.R. Gibb, London, 1929 (Reprinted 1939).

b) Safarnāma-i-Ibn Battūta, Urdū translation by Ra'īs Ahmed Jafārī, Litho. (Karāchī, 1961)

2 Translation of the Chapters on India from Al-Qalqashandī's, Subh ul- 'Ashā, by Otto Spies, (Stuttgart, 1936)

3 Extracts translated in Elliot and Dowson's History of India as told by its own historians, Vol. III.

4 India in the fifteenth century, edited by R.H. Major, Hakluyt Society Publication, (London, 1857).

The Ahkām us Sultāniyah¹ of Abū-Ḥasan 'Alī al Baghdādī al-Māwardī, the Siyāsatnāma² of Abū 'Alī Ḥasan ibn-i 'Alī Tūsī Nizām ul mulk, and the Muqaddimah of Ibn Khaldūn, are excellent works for the study of the origins of Muslim institutions. These works served as the model for the subsequent development of Muslim political thought.

The Tārīkh i-Mubārak Shāhī⁴ of Yahya bin Ahmed bin 'Abdullāh Sirhindī, written in 1434 A.D., begins with the reign of Mu'izz al-Dīn. Up until the reign of Firūz Tughlaq, the work is mostly based on the authority of contemporary writers. The Raḍat us Safā⁵ of Mir Khwand, the Tabaqāt-i Akbarī⁶ of Nizām ud-Dīn Ahmed Bakhshī, the Muntakhab ut Tawārikh⁷ of Abdul Qādir Badāyūnī, the Gulshan-i-Ibrāhīmī⁸ also known as Tārīkh-i-Firishta by Muhammad Hūdū Shāh

1 Urdu translation by Sayyid Muhammad Ibrāhīm, Litho. (Karāchi, 1965)

2 a) Persian text: Edited by Muhammad Qazwīnī, (Tehran, 1956)
 b) The Book of Government, English translation by Hubert Darke, (London, 1960).
 c) Siyāsatnāma, Urdu translation by Shāh Ḥasan 'Atā, Litho. (Karachi, n.d.).

3 a) English translation by Franz Rosenthal, 3 Vols. (London, 1958).
 b) Urdu translation by Mawlāna Sa'd Ḥasan Khān yūsufī, Litho. (Karachi, n.d.).

4 Bib. Indica, edited by Maulavī Hidāyat Ḥussain, (Calcutta, 1931) English translation by K.K. Basū (Gaekwad Oriental Series, Baroda 1932).

5 Tehran, 1854.

6 Bib. Indica, edited by B. De and Maulavī Hidāyat Ḥussain (Calcutta, 1927).

7 Bib. Indica, edited by Maulavī Ahmed 'Alī, 3 Vols. (Calcutta, 1869)

8 Litho. (Bombay, 1832), translated by J. Briggs, History of the rise of Muhammadan power in India, 4 Vols. (London, 1829).

Firishta and the ¹Tārīkh-i-Haqqī of 'Abdul Haqq were written between the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. These works are compiled from earlier sources, but where they provide additional information no authority is quoted. Firishta, however, mentions his authorities for the extra information that he gives, but his dates and names are often incorrect, nor are his statements authentic.

The ²Rāhat us Sudūr of Najm ud-Dīn Abū Bakr Muḥammad Bin 'Alī-ar Rāwandī is a history of the later seljūqs and the Tārīkh-i-
³jahān Gushā of 'Alā ud-Dīn 'Alā Malik juwaynī is a history of Mongol Central Asia. The last named gives useful information about Mongol activities against jalāl ud-Dīn, and also of Mongol relationship with the Turkish power in India. The ⁴Tārīkh-i-Wassaf of 'Abd ullaḥ bin Fadl ullaḥ Shīrāzī written about the first quarter of the fourteenth century, does not give much information about India's political history. It, however, acquaints us with Mongol activities on the Indian frontier, and their relationship with the malcontents of Delhi Court.

The ⁵Āthār us Sanādīd of Sir Sayyid Ahmed Khan, the Chronicles

1 Rieu 1, Add. 26,210.

2 Edited by M. Iqbal, Gibb memorial series, (London, 1921).

3 Edited by Mirzā Muḥammad, Leyden 1916; English translation by J.A. Boyle, 2 Vols. Manchester University Press, 1958.

4 Rieu, Add. 23,517; Extracts translated in Elliot and Dowson, History of India as told by its own historians, Vol. III.

5 Urdū Text, Karāchi, 1966 .

of the Pathān Kings of Delhi¹ by Edward Thomas, and the
Coinage and Metrology of the Sultāns of Delhi² by H. Nelson
Wright provide architectural and numismatic evidence for the
political history of the period.

The Cambridge History of India, Vol. III,³ edited by Sir
Wolseley Haig, S. Lane-Poole's Medieval India,⁴ and A.B.M.
Habīb ullāh's Foundation of Muslim rule in India,⁵ have their
usefulness as subsidiary sources. Where I have differed from
the last three works, it is based on a thorough examination of
the primary sources. Raverty's Translation of the Tabaqāt i-
Nāsiri⁶ is not a mere translation but a mine of information, and is
indispensable to anyone studying the early Muslim history of
India. The usefulness of Dr. I.H. Qureshi's Administration
of the Sultanate of Delhi⁷ for understanding the administrative
system of the period can hardly be over-emphasized. Other
helpful works are Dr. R.P. Tripathi's Some aspects of Muslim
Administration,⁸ Dr. Tārāchānd's Influence of Islām on Indian
Culture⁹ and Dr. C.E. Bosworth's The Ghaznavids,¹⁰

1 London, 1871

2 Government of India Publication, (Delhi, 1936).

3 Cambridge, 1928.

4 London, 1903.

5 Allāhabād, 1961.

6 London, 1881 (2 Vols.).

7 Lahore, 1942.

8 Allāhabād, 1935.

9 Allāhabād, 1963.

10 Edinburgh University Press, 1963.

CHAPTER I

The Slave System in Islamic Administration

In Arabia, before the advent of Islam, slaves were usually acquired by capture during tribal feuds. In the course of such conflicts women and children would be carried as prizes who, if not ransomed by their tribes, were then sold as slaves.¹ The slave was an integral part in the life of an Arab. In fact, a respectable Arab family was considered incomplete without slaves. The slave performed domestic and industrial labour for his master; like a commodity he was also offered as a present, more especially to a bride as a wedding gift.² In time of need he was also required to fight on behalf of his tribe.³

As part of the social order, the slave system continued in Arabia even after the coming of Islam. Writing in the twentieth century, Bertram Thomas says that the Arabs, as a body, are too proud to work as servants and far too independent in spirit to obey a master, on account of which the well-to-do have either to do their own work or to resort to slavery. He calls the maintaining of slaves as a traditional part of the social structure of the Arabs.⁴

1 Professor W. Montgomery Watt, Muhammad at Medina, p.293 says that Zayd b. Harithah, the adopted son of Muhammad, was thus carried off as a stripling and sold at 'Ukaz.

2 Jurjī Zaydān, Umayyads and 'Abbasids, translated by D.S. Margoliouth, (G.M.S.) p. 14.

3 Muhammad at Medina, p. 293.

4 Bertram Thomas, The Arabs, p.266.

Slave-holding, since the early days of Islam until recent times, has been an established institution throughout the Muslim world. Perhaps, as the keeping of slaves added to the prestige of their owner, and enabled him to display his power, every nobleman and everyone who was possessed of means owned a few slaves.² A Sultān usually possessed considerable number of slaves belonging to different races.³ Sultān Firūz Tughlaq had 180,000 slaves. His proselytizing zeal probably prompted him to build a slave community of war captives. He, therefore, ordered his mugta's and officers to capture slaves during war, and send the best to him to be used in the service of his court.⁴

The mugta's, aware of their Sultān's weakness in this respect, brought well-attired, attractive slaves with them when they visited the royal court, to be offered as gifts. He who brought a large number of slaves entitled himself to more royal favour, while he who came with a small number received proportionate consideration. Some of these slaves were attached to the

1 Shams Sirāj-i 'Afīf, Tārīkh-i Firūz Shāhī, p.398. Khān-i jahān Maqbul, during Firūz Tughlaq's absence from the capital, would ride in the vicinity of Delhi with his slaves and children, and make a show of being the deputy of the Sultān.

2 Ibn Battūta, translated and selected by H.A.R. Gibb, p.205. Ibn Battuta records that in Delhi every person while travelling is accompanied by a slave-boy who carried his bed on his head; Mrs. Meer Hasau 'Alī, Observations on the Mussulmans of India, Vol.II, p.323, she describes that even in the nineteenth century the poorest lady in India retained a number of slaves and domestics.

3 Khwand Amīr, Habīb us siyar, B.M. Add. 27,237, Vol.II, f 475a. The author says that Mu'izz al-Dīn had a craze to purchase slaves and rear them up.

4 'Afīf, pp. 270,268. 'Afīf says that the slaves of Firūz Tughlaq were spread throughout the provinces and some were even sent to settle at Mecca.

provincial army and were assigned villages for their maintenance. Those who stayed in cities were given allowances varying from ten to a hundred tankas, either monthly or every three, four or six months. The periodical payment and, in some cases, the small amount, suggest that allowances to city-dwelling slaves were in addition to their other requirements of life with which they were¹ supplied.

A Sultān exercised absolute authority over his slaves, both as master and as king. When Haibat Khān, a slave of Ghīyāth ud-Dīn Balban, killed a person under the influence of drink, Ghīyāth ud-Dīn displayed his sense of justice and his authority as master, by handing over Haibat Khān to the widow of the deceased, and asking her to stab him with a knife until he died.²

Moreover, whatever a slave possessed belonged to the master. Fīrūz Tughlaq was once presented with a crore (ten million) of tankas by one of his slaves named Bashīr. The Sultān accepted it, as in the final analysis it really belonged to him, being the³ property of his slave.

1 'Afif, p.272. 'Afif says that "Alā ud-Dīn Khaljī, possessed about 50,000 slaves who formed the fighting squads and were attached to every branch of the administration.

2 Dīyā ud-Dīn Baranī, Tārīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī, p.40. Baranī says that Balban first inflicted five hundred stripes on Haibat Khān, perhaps as the dispenser of justice, and then handed him over to the widow saying "this murderer is my slave, whom I make over to you to be killed with a knife."

3 'Afif, p.442.

In 1192 A.D., when Mu'izz al-Dīn defeated the combined princes of India under Prithvīrāj, he was confronted with a formidable situation. The people of India in general, and the subdued Rājput princes, as was to be expected, were hostile. Threats of invasion from the Mongols who had burst like a storm from the north-west of China was no small danger.¹ His only physical force in India was his army, which, according to Minhāj, was 120,000 with which he had encountered Prithvīrāj.² It was by no means adequate to contain the threatening dangers.

Besides, Mu'izz al-Dīn's main mission was to found a Muslim kingdom in India. Nizāmī's statement "the Turkish occupation of India was the inevitable result of the emigration of races from Mongolia and Central Asia",³ is not the whole truth. The wealth of India of which much had been known from the invasions of Maḥmūd of Ghazna was no less an attraction. Administration of the conquered territories, therefore, figured as one of his most immediate problems. Since those were days of slow communications, it was impossible for any ruler to govern effectively the remoter parts of the kingdom from his capital.

1 E.B. Havell, A short history of India, p.131. According to Havell, muslim rulers needed the entire military strength of the Muslim world to contend only against Chingiz, who at the head of his well-organized army had begun his terrific drive across Asia and Eastern Europe.

2 Minhāj al Sirāj, Tabagāt-i Nāsiri, p.119

3 K.A. Nizāmī, Religion and Politics in India during the Thirteenth Century, pp. 90-91.

As such, the provinces required loyal officers, who were to collect revenues and enforce the authority of the Sultān. For the palace-service, also, a fund of human material was¹ necessary. The man-power resources at the disposal of the conqueror was far too insufficient to cope with the situation. Thus, the ruler's desperate need was to procure men somehow. One of the answers consisted in purchasing men of foreign origin² and training them for their ultimate responsibilities. The tradition of giving important offices to slaves had existed since the ninth century A.D., from the days of the 'Abbāsids.³

Aḥmed ibn Ṭutūn, the son of a slave of the Caliph, Mā'mūn, was the deputy of Bāyakkāk in Egypt. He declared himself independent in 875 A.D. and established a short-lived dynasty there which lasted until 905 A.D., when Egypt again came under the Caliph's authority.⁴

In Fāṭimid Egypt, 909-1171 A.D., both black and white slaves held important offices in the palaces and were, also,⁵ posted as guards.

1 Nizām ul-mulk, *Sīyāsatnāma*, p.108. Nizām ul-mulk recommends that five to ten thousand pages should be available at a short notice when needed.

2 Amīr Khusrau, *Ijāz-i Khusrawī*, Vol. II, pp.141-144. Even a century after the establishment of Muslim rule in India, Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn Khaljī urged the merchants of Ma'bar and Cambay to purchase for him among other rarities, the ghulāman-i jāngi (slaves to be employed as soldiers).

³ Sir W. Muir, *The Caliphate*, p.513.

⁴ Sir W. Muir, *The Caliphate*, p.537; R. Levy, *The Social Structure of Islām*, p.420.

⁵ Sir W. Muir, *The Mamlūk or Slave dynasty of Egypt*, p.2.

The Seljūqs, who ruled over a large part of Central and Nearer Asia from the eleventh to the thirteenth century, organised their army and civil force with a body of Turkish slaves.¹

The nucleus of the Saffarids, the Samānids, and the Ghaznavids, army and civil officials were the slaves.²

In Islamic countries there was no social opprobrium in being a slave. Theoretically, a slave was the property of his master, but in actual practice, he was treated just like other members of the family. Minhāj says that Qutb ud-Dīn Aybek, while a slave of the chief Qādī Fakhr ud-Dīn 'Abdul 'Azīz Kūfī read the Qur'ān with the sons of his master and also received instructions in horsemanship, shooting and archery. Mu'izz al-Dīn called his slaves as his sons.³

To be a personal slave of the Sultān was in fact an honour.⁴ In Eastern Islamic countries it was one of the stages in the elevation to dignity and power. The slave enjoyed a privileged position in relation to the free man, who had no opportunity of a meteoric rise to power.⁵

¹ Stanley LanePoole, Medieval India, p.64, where it is said, "the mamlūk guard of the emperor Malik Shāh formed a school of capable rulers."

² C.E.Bosworth, The Ghaznavids, pp.98-106.

³ T.N., pp.138,132; Tārīkh-i Firishṭa, Translated by J.Briggs, Vol.I, Firishṭa says that Mu'izzal-Dīn educated his slaves and adopted them as his sons; B.Miller, The Palace School of Muhammad the Conqueror, p.71.

⁴ Afif, p.395. Qiwām ul-mulk, in spite of being a free man called himself a slave of Sultān Muhammad Tughlaq.

⁵ Sir Wolseley Haig, 'Turks and Afghāns', Cambridge history of India, Vol.III, p.61.

To a Sultān, a dependable slave was the protector of his life. The office of Jāndār, invariably went to the faithful and loyal slaves. The troops in the capital consisted of royal slaves and guards like the Jāndārs, a testimony of the Sultan's complete faith in their loyalty¹. When in battle, they formed the centre of the army and were directly under the command of the king.² 'Afīf informs us that forty thousand slaves daily attend Sultān Fīrūz Tughlaq as his guards, either at the palace or in his equipage. The figure may seem to be exaggerated, but the keenness of the Sultān to rehabilitate his large number of slaves is well known.³

A faithful slave seldom failed to enjoy the affection and trust of his master, and his meritorious services rarely went unrewarded.⁴ Mu'izz al-Dīn, in recognition of Iletmish's bravery against the Khokars, in 1206 A.D., asked Qutb ud-dīn not only to manumit him, but, also, to look after him properly, as he was full of promise.⁵

A loyal slave could, also, attain to the highest office even before his manumission, and if he had discharged his responsibilities creditably, he could as well aspire for the hand of his master's daughter in wedlock.⁶ When slaves gave evidence of their worthiness to

¹ H.G. Raverty, Translation of the Tabaqāt-i Nasrī, Vol I, p603n] Raverty says, the Jāndārs were trustworthy slaves.

² L.H. Qureshī, Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi, p.133; T.N. pp 183, 323. Minhaj calls them 'lashkar-iqalb'

³ 'Afīf, p.270.

⁴ T.N. p.120. Mu'izz al-Dīn after conquering the territories of India placed them in charge of his trusted slave Qutb ud-Dīn and returned to Ghazna.

⁵ Ibid, pp. 169-170

⁶ T.N. p.141. Qutb ud-Dīn being satisfied with the abilities of Iletmish, married him to his daughter.

succeed a sovereign, the latter without hesitation preferred them to the descendants of the royal family.¹ Lane-Poole has very ably analysed the reasons for preference to a slave over a royal descendant. "While a brilliant ruler's son is apt to be a failure, the slaves of a real leader of men have often proved to be equals of their master.....He (the son) may or may not inherit his father's talents; even if he does, the very success and power of the father creates an atmosphere of luxury that does not encourage effort,.....On the other hand the slave is the 'survival of the fittest'; he is chosen for physical and mental abilities, and he can hope to retain his position in his masters' favour only by vigilant effort and hard service."²

During the early days of Muslim rule in India, the courts of Ghazna and Delhi were a paradise for the slave dealers. The chroniclers inform us that Mu'izz al-Dīn possessed several thousands of slaves, which may be said to have been dictated by necessity.³ The shrewd slave-dealer would cautiously select

¹ T.N., pp131-132, Mu'izz al-Dīn mentioned his slaves as his successors ignoring his brother's son, Ghiyath ud-Dīn Maḥmūd.

² Stanley Lane-Poole, Mediaeval India, p.64.

³ T.N., p.132.

his human wares, and spare no effort to present them in an attractive form to the royal customer so as to receive a handsome price in return.¹ Undoubtedly, the best slaves went to the king and the eminent nobles at a high price.² Sometimes the nobles, also, sold their trained slaves to the Sultān. Iletmish purchased Malik Naṣīr ud-Dīn from the descendants of Malik Bahā ud-Dīn Tugh ril.

¹ A. Mez, The Renaissance of Islām, translated by S. Khudā Bukhsh, and D.S. Margolouth, p.160., where it is said that the slave-dealers in order to sell their human-wares "paint blue eyes black, yellow cheeks red, make emaciated faces chubby, remove the hair from the cheek, make light hair deep-black, convert the straight into curly, thin into well rounded arms, efface small-pox marks, warts, moles and pimples; Kai Kāṣ ibn Iskandar, Qābūs nama, p.63, recommends the following marks to be observed for purchasing a brave slave. "thick hair, tall and erect body, powerful-build, hard flesh, thick bones, coarse skin, straight limbs, firm joints, tight tendons, sinews and blood vessels prominent and visible on the body, broad shoulders, deep chest, thick neck, round head - preferably bald, concave belly, buttocks drawn in, long strides and black eyes; T.N, p.168, Iletmish was sold with necessary preparations.

² T.N. p.247, Iletmish purchased Qawr ud-Dīn Tamar Khān for 50,000 ḡiṭas.

A Sultān could hardly afford to miss a slave who impressed as promising. Minhāj says that Mu'izz al-Dīn had forbidden the purchase of Iletmish, at Ghazna, on account of the high price demanded by his slave-dealer. When Qutb ud-Dīn saw Iletmish, he requested the Sultān's permission to purchase him. The restriction was modified and Qutb ud-Dīn was allowed to buy him at Delhi.¹

During the late twelfth and the early thirteenth century, the Turkish slaves were chiefly in demand, as they had acquired a reputation for their martial qualities.² Mu'izz al-Dīn was a great admirer of the Turkish slaves. Out of his contingent of many thousand slaves, a large number were of Turkish origin. Nizām ul mulk expresses his definite preference for Turkish Slaves, because they came of a race which had proved its ability for loyal service.³

The dependence of a ruler on the support of a homogenous body was not without its attending dangers. The chief cause of confusion in the Delhi Sultanate from 1236-1266 A.D. was the domination of the Turks in every sphere of activity. During the campaign of Sultān Rukn ud-Dīn Fīrūz in 1236 A.D. against his disaffected nobles, his Turkish slaves played havoc in the neighbourhood of Delhi.⁴ When Rādīya marched against Altūniya in 1240 A.D., the Turkish slave force

¹ T.N.p.168. The slave-dealer, after bargaining for almost five years, finally succeeded in selling Iletmish; 'Abdul Haqq, *Tarikh*, B.M. Or.26, 210, f.7b. The author says that a Turk of Iletmish's qualities and beauty had not till then come to Ghazna.

² C.T.H.Walker, 'Jahiz on the exploits of the Turks' *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1915, pp 631-697.

³ *Siyāsat nāma*, p.108

⁴ T.N. p.183.

betrayed her at Bhatinda, and made her over to the enemy to be imprisoned.¹

From the time of Iletmish the need for slaves became more pressing. The Mu'izzī amīrs had challenged the accession of Iletmish and had, also, engaged him in a battle in which they suffered defeat.² This probably impelled Iletmish, to building a nucleus of personal slaves, whose unflinching allegiance, on account of their lack of local interest, would guarantee his own protection and, also, assure the succession of his nominee.³ Ibn Battūta informs us that Iletmish would send merchants to Samargand, Bukhārā and Turmuz in order to purchase slaves for him. The Tabaqāt-i Nāsiri and the Futūh usSalātin give us to understand that the slave-dealers frequently visited the court of Delhi.⁴

The accession of each of the first four successors to Iletmish was sudden and unexpected, and, also, very brief. This, perhaps, did not leave them with much time to mobilise a contingent of slaves for themselves.

Sultān Nāsir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd possessed slaves but the domination of the Shamsī maliks during his reign (1246-1266) suggests that they were neither large in size nor effective as a force.⁵

¹ Yahya Sirhindi, Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhi, p.27

² Hasan Nizāmī, Tāj ul ma'āthir, I.O.¹⁴⁸⁶ ff 214a-216b; T.N., P.170.

³ The Social Structure of Islām, p.418. Levy says that sovereigns took great care to win the allegiance of their troops for ensuring the succession of their nominee.

⁴ Travels of Ibn Battūta, as quoted in History of India as told by its own historians, Elliot and Dowson, Vol.III, p.594; T.N., pp.254,259,260; 'Isami, p.117

5 T.N.p.214. Sultān Nāsir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd granted one hundred slaves to the author of the Tabaqāt-i Nāsiri to be presented to his sister in Khurāsān where she was in financial distress; Raverty, op.cit., Vol, I, p. 696. Raverty has forty slaves as the gift to Minhāj.

A. Palace Training of Pages

The contemporary chroniclers of the early Turkish rule in India give very little information on the training of palace-pages. But the fact that slaves received training before being assigned an office is scarcely to be disputed. Scattered evidence gives the clue that a training system did exist during the period.¹ Minhāj furnishes only the official structure of the Sultān's court. Offices were then chiefly in the possession of slaves. The Turks, who came fresh from the steppes hardly possessed any substantial knowledge either in the art of administration or in the science of warfare.

Admittedly, it was the aim of the Turkish rulers in India to discover youths of exceptional merits and to train them as warrior-statesman.² When such Turkish slaves or adventurers arrived in India, they had first of all to shed their earlier proclivities and to cultivate in them a sense of duty and discipline.

A training to this end was to be considered essential, as it rendered the incumbents fit for wars and other active employments. It is likely that the Sāmānid system of training, as recommended by Nizām-ul-mulk, was accepted as a basis by the early Muslim rulers of India. The prescribed training extended over a period of seven years.³

¹ Baranī, p.108 Baranī says that Amīn Khān was a trained army commander; 'Afif in Takikh-i Firuz Shahi, page 273, says that during the reign of Firuz Tughlaq slaves were sent to the amīrs and malīks in the provinces, to be trained in their various duties.

² Busbecq writing in Augerii Giesbenii Busbequii omnia quae extant, Pest, 1758, pp.234-77, 262-63, as quoted by B. Miller "The curriculum of the Palace School," The Macdonald Presentation Volume, p 308, "The Turks rejoice greatly when they find an exceptional man as though they had acquired a precious object, and they spare no labour or effort in cultivating him; especially if they discern he is fit for war.

³ Siyāsat nāma, p.110

In the first year the slave was to serve on foot at the stirrup wearing a 'zandanjī' garment¹; and on no account even in private could he ride a horse, and if he did so he was to be punished.

In the second year the tent-leader would inform the hajib of his progress, and if satisfactory a Turkish horse with plain harness was given to him. After he had served for one year with a horse and whip, he was given a belt to gird on his waist.² In the fifth year he received a better saddle, and a bridle, ornamented with stars, and, also, a rich cloak with a club which he hung on his club-ring. In the sixth year he was granted a coloured-dress (perhaps to be worn while parading). In the seventh year he was given a single apex, sixteen-peg tent and three slaves, and the rank of tent-leader was conferred by decorating him with silver wire and Ganja clothing.³

The prevailing circumstances in India hardly suggest that the recommended curriculum was rigidly followed. Conditions demanded the utilisation of all available human materials at the earliest opportunity. Therefore, for the raw-Turk, a basic training to the extent which could make him equal to the needs of the time, can be assumed. Subsequent

1. Siyāsatnāma (ed. Qazwīnī), p.263, Qazwīnī says that according to some 'zandanjī' is a fine cloth while according to others it is a coarse material; W.Barthold, Turkistan down to the Mongol invasion, p.227. Barthold says that Zandanjī derives its name for the Bukharan village of Zandan.

² Hubert Darke in his translation of the Siyāsat nāma, pp 104-105, mentions training in the fourth year, also, when the slave was given a quiver and a bow case to fasten at the time of mounting. As the Persian text edited by Qazwīnī does not mention what Darke says, it seems that the third stage of training lasted for two years.

³ Barthold, op.cit., p.227, Ganja is the present Elizabetpol.

palace-duties served as the nursery to train them for higher offices. On acquiring a brilliant person, the Sultān would keep him close to himself and devote his personal energies in cultivating the former's qualities. Qutb ud-Dīn stimulated Iletmish to more devoted duties by frequently raising his status.¹ A slave possessed of qualities usually rose to a high rank.² Career was open to talents, while the lazy and the dull had no future and lived in obscurity.³

At the preparatory stage, instruction most probably was given in the polite arts, physical exercises and specialized vocations. As the State business was transacted in the Persian language, it inevitably followed that the first business of a Turk was to learn this language. Since the producing of loyal Muslims was one of the concerns of the infant Muslim State, a knowledge of the Arabic language which would help to read the Qur'ān, was also to be acquired.⁴ Gymnastic exercises, and participation in sports of various kinds, which increased the strength and agility of the body must have been

¹T.N, p.169

²Travels of Ibn Battūta, as quoted in History of India as told by its own historians, Elliott and Dowson, Vol. III, p.594, where it is said that Balban rose from the low post of a water-carrier to the rank of a Sultān; S.LanePoole, Mediaeval India, p.78, 'Isami, informs us that in the beginning Balban was given the job of a menial.

³T.N, p.242. Malik 'Izzud-Dīn Tughril could become amīr-i-lakhur only after a long time. He had earlier given proof of his carelessness by losing Iletmish's specially decorated ink-pot.

⁴T.N, pp 284-285, Arkalī Bad-bak Saif ud-Dīn, a slave of Iletmish, held the post of Judge for a period of eighteen years, when, according to Minhraj, he guided himself by the laws of the Shar'iah.

an important part of the training. The title of 'Hazār Mardah', conferred by Iletmish on Malik Kabir Khān Ayyāz, suggests that the physical strength of the latter was equal to that of one thousand persons.¹

Since the cavalry force figured as the deciding factor in Indian wars, cavalry exercises leading to fine horsemanship, were indispensable.² The Subh ul A'shā says that slaves occupied the front rank in the battle-field. Being attired in light-dress and equipped with shields and weapons, they were posted in the front row holding the ropes of elephants in their hands. As they were the first target of attack, a training in the methods of warfare could not be dispensed with.³

The stage of vocational training, perhaps followed the completion of instruction in the liberal arts and strenuous physical exercises. As pages were required to attend the Sultān in various capacities, such as tashidār, silāhdār, farrāsh, sāci-i khāṣ, shurbdār

¹T.N., p.234; The Macdonald Presentation Volume, pp 318-319. Where it is said that in the Ottoman empire initial exercises were the lifting and carrying of heavy-weights. Each year during the festivities, competitive tests in the lifting and carrying of heavy-weights were held, which were attended by the Sultān and all members of the Palace-school.

²T.N., p.258. Minhāj says that Malik Taj ud-Dīn Sanjar Kureṭ Khān, was an expert horseman and a skilled archer. While riding he would have two horses under saddle. When the horses were in a fast gallop he would jump from one to the other and then return back to the first. In archery, no enemy or game could escape him. He would collect his game by spurting his horse ahead of the retinue and would not use a hunting dog, leopard or hawk.

³Subh ul a'shā, Indian portion translated by Otto Spies, p.76; T.N. pp259-260. Minhāj says that Saif ud-Dīn Bat Khān Aybek, was perfect in war-like accomplishments, and Taj ud-Dīn Sanjar Tiz Khān, was famed for his valour and military talents.

etc., training in the rules of etiquette and the various duties was undoubtedly essential.

It could, also, be asserted that training in works of technical nature, such as those connected with the Treasury, was imparted to the incumbents.¹

Besides the rulers, men of high social status and, also, slave dealers trained their slaves.² In the Ottoman empire the prince, the lord, and even the Emperor himself, would have their children instructed in some art or science, so that it could prove an asset if they came across adverse days.

1 T.N. p.248 Minhāj says that Malik Hindū Khān, a slave of Iletmish, started his career in the palace as a keeper of the hunting leopards, later he became the torch-bearer and thereafter the ewer-keeper. He finally held the office of the royal treasurer; Qābusnāma, p. 132, where it is said, "an appointment should be given to one who is adapted to it, and not to one who lacks the needful capacity."

2 E.B. Havell, Aryan rule in India, p. 293, Havell calls Qutb ud-Dīn an expert archer as he succeeded in killing Rājā jaychandra with the shot of his arrow.

CHAPTER II

The Palace hierarchy and the Religious Institutions

A The Sultān

Nizam ul-mulk says, God at all times chooses a human-being for looking after the interest of the world and the well-being of the people. He probably aimed at establishing the theory of the divine-right of a ruler, which made the chosen human-being a representative of God on earth. The early Muslim rulers of India came to be addressed as Sultān, Vice-gerent of God, Shadow of God on earth, and so on.

The existence of a law-enforcing authority is the basic necessity of a civilised society, without which lawlessness and confusion would prevail, peace and security would vanish, and civilisation would remain under the threat of extinction.

Adam Smith lays down three essential duties for a sovereign. Firstly, to protect society from violence and invasion of other independent societies; secondly, to protect every member of a society from injustice or opposition of another member of the same society, and thirdly, to maintain and erect certain public works and public institutions.

¹ Siyāsatnāma, p.5

² Baranī, p.34 (nīyābat-i Khudāī)

³ T.W. Arnold, The Caliphate, p.128; Amīr Khusrau, Qirān us-Sa'dain, p.155

⁴ Fakhr-i Mudabbir, Ādāb ul Mulūk wa kifāyat al-mamlūk, I.O. 647, f. 83b; The author says, if there were no Sultān the people would devour each other.

⁵ Adam Smith, Wealth of Nations, 'Every man's Library edition', Vol.II, pp. 182-211.

The term 'Sultan' occurs in the Qur'ān as an abstract expression of 'power, authority'.¹ Towards the end of the first century of the Hijrah, the word Sultān was used in the 'Egyptian papyri' for the governor of a province, which denoted an official with delegated powers.² Maḥmūd of Ghazna was probably the first important Muslim ruler to style himself as Sultān.³ Usually it was the Caliph's prerogative to confer such a title but sometimes the successor of an overlord, also, exercised this privilege. Minhāj says that after Mu'izz al-Dīn's death, his royal successor Ghiyāth ud-Dīn Maḥmūd, honoured Qutb ud-Dīn with the title of Sultān.⁴ It appears that Iltutmish after his accession styled himself as Sultān Shams ud-Dīn. Arnold, apparently without authority, states that Iltutmish was conferred the title of Sultān by the 'Abbāsīd Caliph, al-Mustansir, when his emissaries visited Delhi on February 19, 1229 A.D.⁵

The Qābusnāma lays down six essential qualifications for a Sultān. He should inspire awe and fear in the hearts of the people, dispense justice, practise generosity, be capable of protecting his kingdom, symbolise dignity and remain truthful to his words.⁶

¹ Qur'ān, 14.12,13.

² Arnold, op.cit., p.202; K.M.Ashraf, 'Life and Conditions of the People of Hindūstan,' Journal and Proceedings Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol.I, 1935, p.158. Ashraf says that the term Sultān signified full and undisputed powers of the monarch.

³ S.Lane-Poole, The Muhammadan Dynasties, p.286.

⁴ T.N. p.140; Arnold, op.cit., p.99.

⁵ Raverty, op.cit., Vol.I, p.624. Raverty refers to a coin of Iltutmish dated 612 A.H/1215-16 A.D., bearing the inscription 'Sultan Shams-ud-Din'; In the Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī, p.17, it is stated that Iltutmish assumed the title of Sultān after defeating Arām Shah in 1210 A.D., but it does not mention any authority; Arnold, op.cit., p.86.

⁶ Qābusnāma, p.135.

According to the Sīyasatnāma, it is obligatory for a king to interest himself in developing works for promoting the prosperity of his people. These should include, providing irrigation facilities, building bridges, inns and towns, and the raising of fortifications, lofty buildings, magnificent dwellings and schools for the seekers of knowledge.¹

Providing redress to the aggrieved should also be one of the main concerns of a ruler, as it would curb the activities of those given to tyranny. The strength of a kingdom and the activities of its people could be measured primarily in the scales of justice.²

In the absence of any definite law of succession in the Islamic kingdom, in India, during the period under review, a person was raised to the throne by a consensus of opinion, consisting of a limited number of people. These were the nobles, the 'ulemā' and the influential religious men who, in all probability were attached to the royal court.³

A successor nominated by the Sultān whether at his death-bed or before, was quite often ignored.⁴

On the accession of a Sultān the people were required to take a formal oath of allegiance (bay'at-i'āmm) to him. De Santillana says that since the time of Abū Bakr, bay'at has been a 'symbol of acceptance

¹ Sīyasatnāma, p.7.

² M. Habib and Afsar, The Political Theory of the Delhi Sultanate, p.16.

³ T.N., p.170; Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī p.21; Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi, p.52.

⁴ Iltutmish nominated his daughter Rāḍiyya, and Balban named his grandson Kai Kh usrau, but both of them were rejected. (T.N., pp.185,182, Baranī, p.122)

by the people of the person elected.¹ If the sovereign had been originally a slave, it was perhaps necessary for him to show his letter of manumission to the jurists in order to receive their recognition.² This probably happened when the jurists were in doubt about the free status of the sovereign, as others who were also slaves, were not questioned about their freedom. A slave could on no account become a chief because he was unable to freely dispose of himself, his will being controlled by his master.³

For an elected monarch the throne offered no secure position as he always stood the risk of being replaced and, also, of losing his head. At least four successors of Iletmish and one of Balban were dethroned and subjected to tragic consequences for their inability to effectively control their Turkish officers.⁴

After ascending the throne a Sultān would have the Khutbah read in his name throughout the empire. It proclaimed his sovereignty and extended formal recognition to his authority in the distant areas of his kingdom.

¹ De Santillana, 'Law and Society', The Legacy of Islām, p.297; Tarikh-i Mubarak Shahī, p.31. Yahya says that when the Mongols ravaged Lahore in 1241 A.D., Mu'izzud-Dīn Bahrām made the amīrs maliks and other renowned chiefs pledge their loyalty to him for a second time.

² Travels of Ibn Battuta, as quoted in History of India as told by its own historians, Elliot & Dowson, Vol.III, p.591, where it is recorded that the qadī and the lawyers swore their allegiance to Iletmish, after inspecting his deed of manumission.

³ There is no evidence that Quṭb ud-Dīn Aybek and Balban, who were also slaves before their accession were asked to produce their deed of manumission when they ascended the throne; De Santillana, op.cit., p.296, J.H.Nieboer, Slavery as an Industrial System, p.8, where it is said that the master possesses a right not only over the body of the slave but also over his will.

⁴ T.N., pp.184,188,197,201; Baranī, pp.171,173.

The Sikka (coinage) was also an insignia of royalty. Every ruler, when he came to the throne struck coins to commemorate his accession. When a rebel governor defied the authority of the Sultān and assumed independence, he invariably struck the name of his sovereign from the Sikka and Khutbah, and substituted his own.¹

Chatr (royal canopy) and dūr-bāsh² (royal baton), were, also, symbols of royalty, but they were not as important as the Sikka and Khutbah. Members of the royal family and powerful nobles were allowed their use under authority of the Sultān.³ 'Isāmī gives an interesting description how Balban succeeded in persuading Sultān Nāṣir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd to allow him the use of Chatr.⁴

Tirāz was also a privilege of the Sultān, It was the embroidering of the ruler's name with other words of good omen and prayer on the hem of the sovereign's garment which was usually made of gold-brocade or pure silk. The writing was woven with a gold-thread or some other coloured thread different from the colour of the garment in order to make the embroidery work distinct. Sometimes a ruler honoured an officer by allowing him to wear such a garment.⁵

¹ Baranī, p.83. According to Baranī, when Tughril Beg, the governor of Lakhnauti, assumed independence, he took the title of Sultān Mughith ud-Dīn which he used in his Khutbah and Sikka.

² Otto Spies, *op.cit.*, p.75. Muḥammad Tughlaq would have one Chatr when not on the battlefield, but during war time seven Chatrs were held over his head, two of which were well ornamented and were priceless; The dūr-bāsh literally meant 'stand-aside'. It was a kind of spear with two horns or branches, the wood-staff of which was studded with jewels and ornamented with gold and silver. It was carried before the sovereign when he issued forth and also accompanied him in the battlefield (Raverty, Vol.I, p.607, n.5).

³ T.N., p.181., Prince Rukn ud-Dīn, Fīrūz, was allowed the use of Chatr by Ibetmish; T.A.Vol.I p.87. When Balban nominated Prince Muḥammad as his successor he conferred on him a Chatr and a durbāsh.

⁴ 'Isāmī, p.152, 'Isāmī says that Balban solicited a white chatr from Nāṣir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd, because it was the cause of his sickness.

⁵ Ibn Khaldūn, (F.Rosenthal), Vol.II, pp.65,66; Baranī, p.493; Ijaz-i. Khusravi, Vol.I, p.13.

In practice the authority of a Sultān in his kingdom was absolute, but in theory, perhaps, to keep the fiction of the Caliph's legal sovereignty alive, he considered himself as a lieutenant of the court of Baghdād, wherefrom he expected a formal recognition to his kingship.¹ He was the supreme executive authority in his kingdom and also the Commander-in-chief of his forces. He exercised the right of appointing his officers and, also, of dismissing any official however powerful he might be.²

As a legislator, he was perhaps conscious of not transgressing the limits of Shar'iah, but while framing rules for the well-being of his people and country, he considered himself beyond all limitations.³

A Sultān, in order to consolidate his own position, was obliged to maintain a certain standard of religion in a country where his main source of strength were his co-religionists, who, also, were in a minority.⁴ He demonstrated his interest in religion in various ways. Qutb ud-Dīn on his accession, patronised the scholars, jurists, the reciters of Qur'ān, pious men and reformers.⁵ Minhāj says that Iltmish

¹ H.N.Wright, The Sultāns of Delhi, their coinage and metrology, pp.17-21. The Delhi Sultāns, in their coinage recognized themselves as the supporter or helper or right hand of the Caliph.

² T.N., p.298. Sultān Nāṣir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd dismissed Balban, who was his na'ib-i mulk and the most powerful noble in those days.

³ Baranī, p.47. Balban used to say "I do not understand what is religious or irreligious for the country, whatever I think best I act upon it."

⁴ K.M.Ashraf, op.cit., p.147, rightly says that a Sultān had at least to maintain an outward show of respect for the rituals and symbols of Islām.

⁵ Tārīkh-i Fakh̄r ud-Dīn Mubārak Shāh, p.35.

was a sovereign of exemplary faith, who showed respect to recluses, devotees, divines and the doctors of law and religion.¹ According to 'Isāmī, Iletmish built the Hauz-i Shamsī under religious inspiration and poured a flask of zamzam water into it for the benefit of mankind.²

Baranī informs us that Balban was fond of convivialities in his early life, but on becoming a ruler he changed completely. He would regularly offer his prayers and never missed them even when on a journey.³ Despite his desire for princely dignity he would invite religious men to his meals and discuss religious problems with them. He would show his interest in religious sermons (tadhkir) which he quite often attended and would give vent to his emotions by weeping bitterly. Whenever he heard about the death of any scholar or religious person, he made it a point to attend the funeral procession. He would also visit the house of the deceased on the third day (siyūm) of the funeral, when, after consoling the bereaved members he would grant stipends to them.⁴

The Sultān was probably the richest individual in his kingdom. His unlimited wealth helped him to make gestures of his liberality. It enabled him to mobilise a large army and win supporters for himself.⁵

¹ T.N., p.167.

² 'Isāmī, p.111.

³ Baranī, p.46.

⁴ Baranī, pp.46-7.

⁵ Oabushnama, p.135. where it is said that people will not lay down their lives for a ruler, who does not distribute wealth lavishly; Habīb and Afsar, The Political Theory of the Delhi Sultānate, p.22, where the saying of Aristotle is quoted "an army can only become large and well-organised through bold expenditures of enormous treasure"; A.J.Arberry, Kings and Beggars (Translation of first two chapters of Sa'dī's 'Gulistān'), p.45, where it is said, "when the Sultān grudges gold to his soldiery they cannot be ready to sacrifice their lives chivalrously on his behalf."

Qutb ud-Dīn Aybek is known to have bestowed his gifts in lakhs, while Iletmish displayed his munificence by giving a hundred times more than the former.¹

The author of the Masālik ul Absār informs us that Sultān Muḥammad Tughlaq would distribute 20,000 "costly" dresses every year to persons attached to his court. He would also present gold-brocades to the amīrs and their wives. Twenty thousand men, consisting of khāns, maliks, amīrs, sipah sālars, and important officers, daily enjoyed Muḥammad Tughlaq's hospitality both in the morning and evening. When the Sultān himself sat for dinner and supper, he was joined by two hundred learned lawyers with whom he indulged in intellectual discussions.²

Baranī has, perhaps rightly, said that after the prophetic office the next most important is that of the king, and the latter should, therefore remain conscious of the importance of his office and offer thanks to God for the honour conferred upon him. These words imply that a king had a definite obligation towards religion.³

A ruler demonstrated his devotion to the faith by appointing men who were well-versed in ecclesiastical affairs. Such officials included the shaikh ul Islām, the sadr us sudūr, the qādī, the muftī, etc.

¹ T.N. pp. 138, 166; Tārīkh-i Mubarak Shāhī, p. 15. Yahya says that Qutb ud-Dīn earned the title of lakh-baksh for his generosity.

² Masālik ul-Absār fī Mamālik ul Amsār, as quoted in History of India as told by its own historians, Elliot & Dowson, Vol. III, pp. 578, 579.

³ Baranī, pp. 70-1; Tārīkh-i Fakhṛ ud-Dīn Mubārak Shāh, p. 14, for the religious obligations of a Muslim ruler.

B The Court Officials

1 Senior Officials

a) Nā'ib-i mulk

Next in political importance to the sovereign was the nā'ib-i mulk. This office was usually exercised as a temporary device, when a ruler was considered inexperienced and young in age.¹ The nā'ib was generally an influential noble who was either a nominee of the powerful elements of the court or appointed by the Sultān himself.² In some cases, the condition preceding such an appointment was the delegation of sovereign power to the deputy by the de jure ruler. Ikhtiyār ud-Dīn Aytigīn was the first nā'ib-i mulk of the Delhi Sultānate. On his appointment as the nā'ib in 637 A.H./1240 A.D., during the reign of Mu'izz ud-Dīn Bahram, the nobles and commonalty offered their allegiance (bay'at-i āmm) to him in the same manner as they had done to the Sultān.³

A nā'ib was sometimes appointed to deputise with full powers during the sovereign's absence from the capital. When Balban led his expedition to Lakhnautī against Tughril, he authorised Malik Fakhr ud-Dīn, the kotwāl of Delhi to act in his place.⁴

¹ T.N., pp.191, 153; Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī, p.28.

² T.N., pp.191, 198, 294. Ikhtiyār ud-Dīn Aytigīn, the nā'ib-i mulk of Mu'izz ud-Dīn Bahram, and Qutb ud-Dīn Hussain Ghori, the nā'ib-i mulk of Ala ud-Dīn Mas'ud, were the choice of the nobility while Balban was appointed by Sultān Naṣir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd.

³ Ibid, p.253. This is the only instance when allegiance was offered to the nā'ib.

⁴ Baranī, p.85. A deputyship during the ruler's temporary absence was called niyabat-i ghaibat.

A ruler sometimes conferred this office on a noble as a token of affection. 'Alā ud-Dīn Khaljī, appointed Malik Kāfur hazār-dinārī as malik nā'ib (deputy king), due to his weakness for him.¹ 'Alāud-Dīn's son, Qutb ud-Dīn Mubārak Khaljī, also, gave this title to the convert Khusrau for the same reason.²

A powerful noble would sometimes without any authority, become a de facto nā'ib and administer the government on behalf of a weak ruler.³

b) Wakil-i dar

Barthold calls the office of the wakil an important one.⁴ Qureshī says that the wakil-i dar was in many respects considered to be the Sultān's deputy. Minhāj tells us that when 'Imād ud-Dīn Rayhān became the wakil-i dar in 1253 A.D. the entire administration of the kingdom passed into his hands.⁵ According to Nizām ul-mulk, a highly respected person of reputed integrity should be appointed to this office as, the royal palace, kitchen, cellars and stables, the king's children and also, his own retainers, were placed under his care.⁶ It is,

¹ Baranī, p.251, 'Alā ud-Dīn Khaljī was deeply infatuated by the physical charms of Malik Kāfur, for which he made him his malik nā'ib.

² Baranī, pp.389,390.

³ Ibid., p.131. Malik Nizām ud-Dīn, was a dādbak (judicial officer) but he exercised control over the administration of the kingdom without assuming the title of nā'ib.

⁴ Barthold, op.cit., p.229.

⁵ Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi, p.57; T.N., p.298.

⁶ Siyāsat nāma, p.95; Barthold, op.cit., p.229, he says that the wakil managed the domestic affairs of the court.

therefore not unlikely that he, by his association with the palace-establishment exercised great influence in the palace, and, also, commanded respect by successfully discharging his duties. We hear of this office under the Ghaznavids, but according to Nizām ul-mulk, perhaps, it did not continue during the Seljuq period.¹

All orders from the Sultān concerning the royal household passed through him.² This has probably led some scholars to suggest that his functions were secretarial.³ Nizām ul-mulk lays great emphasis on his free accessibility to the Sultān at any hour of the day, for furnishing reports on all matters, seeking advice and rendering accounts of his arrangements and transactions.⁴ From these it seems that his functions were of an administrative nature. The first noble to be assigned this office in the Delhi Sultānate was of Indian origin named 'Imād ud-Dīn Rayhān.⁵ The wakīl-i dar was assisted by a nā'ib-i wakīl-i dar, who was, also, an important noble.⁶

¹ M. Nāẓim, The life and times of Sultān Mahmūd of Ghazna, p.147; H. Darke, Translation of the Book of Government, p.92.

² Adāb ul mulūk wa kifāyāt al mamlūk, I.O. 647, f. 42b.

³ A.M. Hussain, The rise and fall of Muhammad bin Tughlag, p.220. The author calls the wakīl-i dar, an officer who performed the secretarial functions of the court; K.K. Basu in the Translation of Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī, p.50 n.3, says that the wakīl-i dar superintended ceremonies of presentation. I do not think Mr Basu is correct.

⁴ Siyasatnāma, p.95.

⁵ T.N., p.217.

⁶ Barant, pp.36,275; Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī, p.47.

c) Amīr-i hājib

The amīr-i hājib was an important officer of the royal household.¹ As he often belonged to the military aristocracy, in time of need, he was entrusted to lead expeditions against an enemy.² In the palace his rank was equivalent to that of a foreign dignitary.³ He was the most active officer of the Sultān's secretariat. Practically all business of the palace was transacted either through him or through his hājibs.⁴ The office carried much prestige and was usually assigned to a prince of royal blood or a favourite noble.⁵ His powers were very wide. Intending visitors to the court, were first scrutinized by him and then presented to the Sultān in accordance with the court etiquette.⁶ As master of ceremonies, he organised royal festivities and also arranged court functions.⁷ The ruler consulted him on vital matters and included him as a member of his majlis-i khalwat⁸ (secret council). When a ruler

¹ Siyāsatnāma, p.141. Nizām ul-mulk calls him the highest officer at the court; Barthold, op.cit., p.227. He calls him as one of the first dignitaries of the kingdom.

² T.N., p.288.

³ Safarnāma-i Ibn Battūta, (Urdū translation by Ra'is Ahmed ja'fari, p.570, where it is recorded, if the visitor to the Sultān held an important status he stood in the row of the amīr-i hājib, otherwise behind him.

⁴ Ibid., pp.667, 673. where it is said that the hājib conducted Ibn Battūta to his seat and on another occasion obtained an acknowledgement receipt for a letter delivered to him.

⁵ Baranī, p.61. Baranī says that Malik Bektars, the amīr-i hājib, was a favourite noble of Balban.

⁶ Ibn Battūta, (Urdū translation) p.570.

⁷ Afif, p.361.

⁸ Baranī, p.36. When Balban was enraged at the appointment of Kamāl Mahyār, whose father was a Hindū of low birth, he summoned his majlis-i khalwat (secret council), which included the amīr-i hājib, in order to discuss the consequences of such appointments.

held his court the hājibs received petitions from the people and handed them over to the amīr-i hājib who, in turn, presented them to the Sultān. The royal orders were conveyed by him to the secretaries (dabīrs) who communicated them to the petitioners. Those present in the court could hear from him directly.¹ The amīr-i hājib, also acted as a confidential messenger of the Sultān. Important secret messages to different parts of the kingdom were sent through him.² He was the foremost of the hājibs, the Ṣayyid ul hujjāb and Sharaf ul hujjāb standing below him in rank.³ One or two hājibs always waited on the Sultān. Those who attended to the general duties of the ruler were probably styled khās-hājibs. During the reign of Iletmish's successors the post of amīr-i hājib was monopolised by members of the 'famous forty' who practically reduced the rulers to an insignificant position. Ikhtiyār ud-Dīn Aytigīn's proximity to Raḍīya, as her amīr-i hājib, gave him the opportunity to know every detail of the latter's activities and organise conspiracies against her. Badr ud-Dīn Sunqur occupied this post in the reign of Mu'izz ud-Dīn Bahrām, when he ignored even the authority of the Sultān-Malik Qaraqash and Balban held this rank under 'Alā ud-Dīn Mas'ūd.⁴ Saifud-Dīn Aybak Kashlī Khān, occupied this office in the reign of Naṣir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd, and perhaps

¹ Otto Spies, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

² Tāj ul ma'athir, I. O. 1486, f. 182b, where it is said that Sirāj ud-Dīn Abu Bakr, the amīr-i hājib, was sent by Mu'izz al-Dīn from Ghazna to inform Qūtb ud-Dīn at Delhī about his proposed action against the khokars.

³ Ibn Battūta (Urdū translation), p. 570.

⁴ T.N., pp. 187, 193, 250, 287.

strove his best to retain the authority of his brother, Balban, as the de facto ruler. Minhāj addresses Saif ud-Dīn Aybek by the title of malik ul hujjāb, because he was Balban's brother.¹

d) Sar-i jāndār: (chief of the body-guards)

Every ruler possessed a number of personal body-guards called the jāndārs.² As the number of jāndārs was expected to be large, they were probably split up into groups and placed under the command of different chiefs. The chief was styled as Sar-i jāndār.³ As protectors of the ruler's life, the jāndārs and sar-i jāndār were usually loyal and trustworthy people.⁴ Rawlinson informs us that in Persia, men of the highest rank became the bodyguards of kings, and they were usually a force of fourteen to fifteen thousand.⁵

Although the rank of sar-i jāndār was not high in itself, it was nevertheless a stepping stone to a higher office. Iletmish, the future Sultān, was the sar-i jāndār under Quṭb ud-Dīn. Ikhtiyār ud-Dīn Aytigīn the nā'ib-i mulk of Bahram, served as Iletmish's sar-i jāndār. Saif ud-Dīn Aybek Kashli Khan, the younger brother of Balban, and the future āmīr-i hājib, held the post of sar-i jāndār in the reign of Mu'izzud-Dīn Bahram.⁶

¹ T.N., p.278.

² Siyāsāt nama, p.99, Nizām ul mulk recommends that a hundred Dailamī, and a hundred Khurāsānī should remain in constant attendance upon the king whether he is at home or abroad; Baranī, p.30; Qābusnāma, p.134. Kai Kāus says, "If a king's body-guards consist of a single race, the king is virtually a prisoner of his bodyguards."

³ Siyāsāt nama, p.141. Nizām ul mulk says that the post of the Commander of the guards is next in importance to that of the āmīr-i hājib; Baranī, p.30. where it is said that Balban, for his personal safety appointed awe-inspiring body-guards who stood around his person with bared glittering swords.

⁴ T.N., p.115, Mu'izz al-Din had been the sar-i jāndār to his brother, Ghiyath ud-Din.

⁵ George Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, Vol.IV, p.200.

⁶ T N , pp.169,252,279.

Besides having charge of the retinue guarding the king's person, the sar-i jandar also dealt with punishment and execution of certain classes of offenders and criminals. Nizām ul-mulk says that as the office of the guard-commander was concerned with the punishment of wrong-doers, the people feared him more than the king.¹ Minhāj mentions about a noble, Malik Saif ud-Dīn Aybek, who expressed his reluctance to accept the office of sar-i jandar as it involved bloodshed, torture, extortion and oppression upon Muslims and the subjects.²

e) Amīr-i majlis

Usually a noble having the privilege of intimacy with the ruler was appointed as the amīr-i majlis. Iltutmish gave this office to Saif ud-Dīn Aybek Yughāntat on account of his close association with him.³ The officer catered to the recreational needs of the ruler, by organising private parties, where the latter enjoyed the wit and humour of brilliant conversationalists, and intelligent people.⁴ The medieval Sultāns, who were usually without much education, found in such parties the opportunity

¹ Siyāsatnāma, pp.141,142.

² T.N., p.237.

³ T.N. p.238.

⁴ Siyāsatnāma, p.129. Nizām ul mulk recommends that a king should pass some time with his boon-companions (nadīms) in order to refresh himself, by enjoying jests, stories, jokes and curious tales.



of discussing a variety of topics which gave them an access to the finer aspects of life and broadened their outlook.¹ At such parties, the chosen companions of the ruler, who usually received large salaries, assembled to display the qualities of their head and heart.² The amīr-i mailis was held in high esteem by the Sultān as he was one of the few nobles who had the distinction of dining with the ruler.³

f) Amīr-i shikār

Hunting was a favourite sport with the medieval Sultāns.⁴ For an active ruler it was a means of recreation and a period of relief from his hectic palace life. This was, perhaps, the only period when the king could breathe freely with his loyal supporters. Here, the ruler found himself in a surrounding which was free from palace intrigues and court jealousies. Balban would go out on hunting excursions during winter. His hunting party consisted of several thousand men.⁵ Five to six hundred courtiers, a thousand cavalry and a thousand infantry and archers who enjoyed Balban's full confidence usually accompanied him. Besides these, a number of falconers, hunting dogs and leopards,

¹ Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi, p.70.

² Otto Spies, op.cit., p.72.

³ Ibn Battūta, (Urdū Translation), p.579.

⁴ Afif, p.316, Muhammad Tughlaq complains of Firūz Tughlaq's fondness for hunting; Masālik ul Absār, as quoted in History of India as told by its own historians, Elliot and Dowson, Vol.III, pp.579-580, says that when Muhammad Tughlaq would go on a hunting excursion, 100,000 horsemen, 2000 elephants, four wooden horses of two stories, 200 camels, and tents and pavilions of all kinds used to follow him.

⁵ Baranī, p.54.

also, ¹ followed the train of the Sultān. Festivities, music and song, ² were part of these hunting parties. An area near the capital was earmarked for the sport where there could be no outside intrusion. The provinces, also, contained spots where the king could ³ hunt special game. The hunting excursion was organised by an officer called the amīr-i shikār. He, probably, made an early survey of the hunting area as it involved the security of the ruler. A number of officials worked under him who looked after the hunting animals and birds. He was usually an important noble on whose ⁴ loyalty the ruler fully relied. The amīr-i shikār was an accomplished military officer, as in the time of need he was required to lead an army against the enemy. The noble who assisted him in his ⁵ work was known as the nā'ib-i amīr-i shikār.

1 Baranī, p.55; 'Afif, pp. 317-318

2 Ibn Battuta (Urdū translation), p.670.

3 'Afif, pp. 319-328. An area near Bādāun was fixed for Fīrūz Tughlaq's hunting excursion.

4 Baranī, p.54, Baranī says that the post of amīr-i shikār was an important office in the reign of Balban; T.A. Vol. I, p.83; T.N. p.169. Minhāj says that Iletmish was promoted from the post of sar-i jandar to that of amīr-i shikār.

5 'Afif, pp. 115, 318. Malik Khidr Bahrām was the nā'ib-i amīr-i shikār of Firuz Tughlaq.

g) Amīr-i ākhur

The royal horses were placed under an officer called the amīr-i ākhur. As horses, because of their swiftness, played a vital part in warfare against the slow-moving elephants of the ¹ Hindū rulers, they had to be properly looked after. The amīr-i ākhur was a responsible officer of the royal household with a numerous staff under him. The maintenance of order in the stable, and the appointment of junior officers, grooms and water-carriers of the stable were his responsibility. The officer of the stable who remained in permanent attendance on the king, the keeper of the saddlery, the head of the stirrup-holders, and some footmen, ² who followed the ruler's retinue, were also attached to his staff.

There is no information of a royal stud being maintained during the thirteenth century A.D. It was, in fact, not necessary as the wants of the Turkish rulers in respect of horses were supplied ³ by Central Asia, north Punjab and Sind.

1 Baranī, p.52. Balban considered six to seven thousand cavalry quite enough to keep the Hindū chiefs in subjugation; B.P. Mazumdar, in Socio-economic history of northern India, p. 50, quotes Manasollasa Vimsati, II, p. 574 "A king in possession of a strong cavalry need entertain no apprehension regarding his territory".

2 Tadhkirat ul-Mulūk, (Translated by V. Minorsky, G.M.S.) pp. 52, 120.

3 B.P. Mazumdar, Socio-economic history of northern India (1030-1194 A.D.), pp. 50, 51; Baranī, p.53. Prince Muhammad would send horses to Balban from Sind and its adjacent areas.

Minhāj tells us about Badr ud-Dīn Sunqur, the nā'ib-i amīr-i ākhur, that he never absented himself from the gate of the stable¹ even for a single moment, save through unavoidable necessity.

Barani says that 'Alā ud-Dīn Khaljī, in order to check mal-practice and fraud in the royal stable, which involved replacing good animals² with bad ones, regulated the system of branding horses.

The post of amīr-i ākhur was a coveted office and presaged well for its holder. The next appointment of an amīr-i ākhur was usually that of mugta'. Qutb ud-Dīn Aybek, Ghiyāth ud-Dīn Tughlaq and Muḥammad Tughlaq who held this office in their early³ career, ultimately rose to the rank of Sultān.

1 T.N., p.254.

2 Baranī, p. 319.

3 T.N., p. 139; Ibn Battūta, Urdū translation, p.554; Baranī, p.411

2. Junior Officials

There were other functionaries in the palace whom scholars are accustomed to describe as minor officials. According to them¹ their office did not carry much importance. In fact, some of the officers were really important because they were invested with a sufficient degree of responsibility. Barani says that Malik Asgharī, the sar-i dawāt dār of 'Alā ud-Dīn Khaljī was in the² category of the highly important nobles.

a) Chāsh nīgīr (Comptroller of the royal kitchen and food-taster).

The chāsh nīgīr not only supervised the royal kitchen but also tasted the royal food before it was served on the dinner linen. On his careful supervision and honest intentions depended the safety of those who partook of the royal dinner. There was enough wealth in India to seduce men to crime. The office, though minor, was one of immense responsibility. It appears, men of tested honesty were given this post. Malik Tāj ud-Dīn Sanjar Gazlak Khān was assigned this office by Iletmish, most probably on the recommendation of his eldest son Nāsir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd, with³ whom the former had spent his early days. Bitter factionalism

1 I.H. Qureshī, (Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi, p.62) calls the Chashnigir, shurbdar, sag-i khas, farrash, tashtdar and others, minor officials, and discusses them casually. Habib ullah in his, The foundation of Muslim rule in India, p.243, describes these as minor posts having more a decorative value than administrative. Barthold, op.cit., p.228, calls these "smaller offices".

2 Baranī, p.336

3 T.N., p.232.

within the court and hostility towards the invaders from the Hindū population, carried a good deal of risk for the chāsh nīgīr,¹ as he was the first to have a taste of the food.

b) Shurbdār

He was in charge of the drinkables. He served drinks to the guests of the Sultān. Usually before dinner was served in the palace, the shurbdār entertained the royal guests with sherbet.² Like the chāsh nīgīr, a reliable person was usually entrusted with this work.

c) Sāqī-i khās

He was one of the personal attendants of the ruler and stood in the category of the principal members of his private staff.³ In order to make drinking parties more pleasant and romantic, the Sultān usually appointed a person of attractive appearance to this post.⁴ Like the chāsh nīgīr, probably the sāqī-i khās, before serving wine to the king, first tasted it himself lest it should be poisoned.

1 G. Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, Vol. IV, p.166

2 Ibn Battūta, (Urdū translation), pp. 580, 654. Ibn Battūta, who was an eye-witness in the court of Muḥammad Tughlaq, says that the shurbdār served the drinks, therefore the statement of I.H. Qureshī, in his Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi, p.62, that the shurbdār was in charge of drinks which were served by the sāqī-i khās, cannot be accepted as conclusive; K.A. Nizāmī, in his Religion and Politics in India during the thirteenth century, p.125, n.1, has the same opinion as that of Qureshī.

3 Sīyāsatnāma, p. 130

4 T.N. p.242. Minhāj tries to convey the impression that Malik 'Izz ud-Dīn Tughril was appointed by Iltutmish as sāqī-i khās because of his handsome appearance; G. Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, Vol. IV, p. 166

d) Silāhdār

The silāhdār carried the arms of the Sultān and was among¹ the principal members of the ruler's private staff. When the king held audience he stood around the throne and accompanied him when he rode out. Loyal and tried persons were commonly entrusted with this job, as a silāhdār having evil intentions² could be a potential danger to an unarmed Sultān. In Turkey, during the sixteenth century, the sword-bearer was regarded as the first chamberlain of the court and, also, one of its most³ important officers.

1 Siyāsatnāma, p.130

2 Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī, p.69, where we read that Mahmūd Salīm, the silāhdār, stabbed Sultān Jalāl ud-Dīn Khaljī and killed him; Barani in p.234, says that when the first blow of Mūḥammad Salīm (he has Salīm instead of Salīm) failed, he struck the Sultān a second time with the sword and wounded him.

3 B. Miller, The Palace School of Muhammad the Conqueror, p.145. Miller says that a 'distinguished sword-bearer' was granted the privilege of being present in ceremonies such as the celebration of the birthday of the prophet.

C. The Religious Institution

a) Shaikh ul Islām

1

The main functions of the Shaikh ul Islām seem to have been the maintenance of those holymen and fagīrs who enjoyed state patronage,² and the delivering of sermons in presence of the ruler. In fact, he was, also, one of the advisers to the king on religious matters. Sayyid Nūr ud-Dīn Mubārak Ghaznavī held the office in the reign of Iletmish. Baranī, who is noted for his orthodoxy as a chronicler, says that the Shaikh, in one of his sermons, "emphasized that it was the duty of a Muslim ruler to abolish "Kufr" and Kāfirī" (infidelity), shirk (associating other gods with God) and the worshipping of idols, for the sake of God and, also, in order to protect the religion of the prophet of God. If the total annihilation of idolatry was not possible, the ruler should spare no effort to disgrace, insult and slander the mushrik (polytheist) and idol-worshipping Hindūs, who are the worst enemies of God and his prophet."³ Najm ud-Dīn Suhra, and Sayyid Qutb ud-Dīn occupied this post during the reign of Iletmish and Mu'izz ud-Dīn⁴

¹ Baranī, p.343. Baranī out of reverence uses this title for Shaikh Nizām ud-Dīn Auliya although it was not conferred by the Sultan.

² M.T. Titus, Indian Islām, p.68, where it is said that the darwīshes were under the care of the Shaikh-ul-Islām; Masalik ul Absar, as quoted in History of India as told by its own historians, Elliot and Dowson, Vol.III, p.579, where it is said "the fagīrs, whether natives or strangers are under the Shaikh ul Islam"; Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi, p.179.

³ Baranī, pp. 41, 42.

⁴ Abdul Haqq, Akhbār ul Akhīyār, Urdū trans. by Iqbāl ud-Dīn Ahmed, p. 91; T.N., p.196; Tarikh-i Mubarak Shahī, pp. 31-32.

Bahrām respectively.

b) Sadr us Sudūr

The Sadr us Sudūr was an important official commanding much respect. He was responsible for ecclesiastical affairs and, also, looked after all learned men, whether they were inhabitants of the country or were foreigners. The educational establishments were under his control; promising and suitable persons deserving state-stipends were recommended by him to the Sultān.¹ He led the Friday prayers and appointed the khatīb (preacher) and imām (leader in prayer)² to local mosques. Generally the qādī-i mamālīk (chief-justice of the kingdom),³ also held the office of Sadr us Sudūr,³ indicating that law and religion in a wider sense were identical.

c) Qādī

The function of a qādī is to settle disputes between the parties concerned. In the early days of Islām the Caliph himself exercised the office of qādī. 'Umar, the second Caliph of Islām, was the first to have introduced the system of appointing someone else to this office.⁴ During the early Turkish rule, the post of qādī carried much prestige.⁵

¹ Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi, pp.166-167; Masālik ul Absār, as quoted in History of India as told by its own historians, Elliot and Dowson, Vol.III, p.579.

² A.B.M. Habīb ullah, Foundation of Muslim rule in India, pp. 239, 240.

³ Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi, p.166

⁴ Ibn Khaldūn (F. Rosenthal), The Muqaddimah, Vol.I, pp. 452, 453.

⁵ Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī, pp. 65, 66. Yahya says that Sultān Jalāl ud-Dīn Khaljī told Qādī Jalāl ud-Dīn Kāshānī, who was accused of conspiracy against the ruler "An intelligent and eminent person is raised to the rank of a qādī, how could you aspire to a higher position than this".

Stern despots like 'Alā ud-Dīn Khaljī¹ and Muḥammad Tughlaq,² also showed respect to the wisdom and authority of the qādī's office.³ The capital had its own qādī, who was appointed by the ruler himself. He was connected with the department of 'Siyāsat and mazālim'⁴ which gave him jurisdiction over civil and criminal disputes. Every⁵ town which possessed a thick Muslim population had its own qādī.

In dealing with disputes, as the qādī exercised jurisdiction over the lives and property of the Muslims, and also sometimes acted as adviser to the ruler, it was essential for him to be a pious person, thoroughly conversant with Islamic law, and above reproach in private conduct.⁶ In awarding justice he was to remain absolutely impartial.

¹ Baranī, pp. 293-297. 'Alā ud-Dīn Khaljī would consult Qādī Muḥīth on religious issues.

² Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī, p.116, where it is said that Muḥammad Tughlaq personally complained to Qādī Kamāl ud-Dīn that Shāikh Zādah Jāmī had called him a tyrant and sought redress according to the law.

³ Siyāsatnāma, p.43; T.N., p.175. Iletmish personally appointed Minhaj as the qādī.

⁴ T.N., p.3.

⁵ Ibid, p.188; Sir Jādū nāth Sarkār, Mughal Administration, p.110.

⁶ Siyāsatnāma, p.47, where it is said "as a judicial officer the qādī is the standard-bearer and lieutenant to the Caliph."

The Caliph 'Umar advised his qādīs to treat all people equal in the court 'so that the noble would not feel that you would be partial to him, and the humble would not be despaired of justice from you'. The qādī did not make laws, but decided cases according to rules laid down in the fiqh books. His judgment was final; there was no appeal from it. He could compromise a case without violating the spirit of the Islamic law. According to the Caliph 'Umar, 'compromise is permissible among Muslims, provided the agreement is not such which permits of something that is forbidden, or forbids that which is permitted'. A qādī could retract his earlier judgment if on a second thought he is convinced that his revised opinion is more correct; but the interval¹ between the two judgments should not be more than that of a day.

¹ Ibn Khaldūn (F. Rosenthal), Vol.I, p.453; TH.W. Juynboll, 'Qādī', Encyclopaedia of Islam Vol.II, p.606, where it is said, "the qādī has to conduct his court exactly in accordance with the procedure laid down by the law".; Baranī, p.289.

CHAPTER III

The Post-Ghaznavid Period in Muslim India

A. Political History to 1210 A.D.

After the death of Mahmūd of Ghazna in 1030 A.D., India enjoyed respite from major foreign invasion for almost a century and a half.¹ India was then divided into a number of principalities where each ruler was independent in himself. Its rich resources, coupled with the perpetual conflict among its rulers for political hegemony, offered a strong source of temptation to foreign invaders. It was from the mountainous principality of Ghor (lying between Ghazna and Herāt) that Mu'izz al-Dīn, the third Muslim invader, led his attacks on India in the later part of the twelfth century. He directed his earlier raids through the Gomal Pass, a route which was well known to the merchants of Central Asia.²

¹ A.F. Baihaqi, Tārīkh-i Baihaqi, p.267, where it is said that during the reign of Mas'ud, Ahmed Inaltigin was appointed commander-in-chief of the Ghazna army in Hindustān; S. LanePoole, Medieval India, pp. 41, 47, says, in India "for more than a century there had been, if not peace, at least little war. The later kings of Ghazna had been mild, unambitious rulers, and had left the Punjab very much to itself. Probably their Hindū troops and Hindū officials had to some extent Indianated them, and the last descendants of Mahmūd made their home at Lahore without difficulty". T.N., p.14.

² A. Yūsuf 'Ali, Medieval India, p.47, where it is said, "the caravans, each consisting of droves of six thousand horses, came through the Gomal Pass, and found their chief frontier mart in the City of Multān"; A.B.M. Habib ullah, Foundation of Muslim rule in India, p.55.

His first expedition into India was against Multān in 1175 A.D. It was captured from the heretical Carmathians whom Mahmūd had temporarily subdued in the beginning of the eleventh century.¹ Mu'izz al-Dīn followed his conquest by taking the strong fortress of Uchch on the South West of Multān,² which gave him a secure hold on upper Sind. In 1178 A.D. he moved his army against Nahrwāla, the rich capital of Gujerāt, which was ruled by the young king Mulraj II. His soldiers exhausted by the long marches through the Indian desert, suffered a heavy defeat at the hands of the fresh and well-supplied forces of the Rājput ruler.³ The hardship of the long and arduous desert route, which had kept the soldiers waterless and the cattle without forage, made a profound effect upon Mu'izz al-Dīn's future military schemes.

¹ T.N., p.116; Sir Wolseley Haig, *op.cit.*, p.15, says, when Mahmūd besieged Multan in 1005 A.D., its ruler Abu'l Fath Daud purchased peace on a promise of a yearly tribute of 20,000 golden dirhams and abjuration of his heretical doctrines; both Firishṭa and Nizām ud-Dīn say 20,000 dirhams was the price of peace, but Badayuni (*Muntakhāb ut Tawārīkh*, vol I, p.11), says it was twenty times twenty thousand dirhams.

² J. Briggs, *History of the rise of Mahomedan power*, Vol I, p.162, Firishṭa introduces an amusing story which has been disproved by later researches. "Muhammad Ghori (Mu'izz al-Din) finding it would be difficult to reduce the place (Uchch), sent a private message to the Raja's wife promising to marry her if she would deliver up her husband. The base woman replied that she was too old for marriage, but that she had a beautiful and young daughter, whom if he would promise to espouse, leaving her in free possession of her wealth, she would in a few days remove the Raja. Muhammad Ghori accepted the proposal; and this princess, in a few days assassinated her husband and opened the gates to the enemy". Habibullah, *op.cit.*, p.36.

³ T.N., p.116, Muḥāj, and following him, all subsequent historians call the ruler of Nahrwala, as 'Bhim' but subsequent researches are conclusive that it was Mulraj II!

In 1179 A.D., he attacked Peshāwar and wrested it from the Governor¹ of Khusrau Malik, the last of the Ghaznavid rulers. Two years later, Mu'izz al-Dīn advanced against Lāhore when Khusrau Malik compromised by giving his son as hostage and presenting an elephant. In 1182 A.D., the Muslim army occupied Debāl, the capital of Lower Sindh, and acquired possession of the entire territory lying on the sea-coast.² Three years later, in 1185 A.D., Mu'izz al-Dīn again marched to Lāhore but remained satisfied by plundering the countryside and seizing the fortress of Sialkot, which was garrisoned and placed in the charge of Husain Kharmil. Khusrau Malik sensing Mu'izz al-Dīn's ultimate design took the bold step of besieging Sialkot with the help of the khokars, but being unable to capture it returned to Lāhore.³

Provoked by this act Mu'izz al-Dīn marched to Lāhore in 1186 A.D., and when Khusrau Malik came to negotiate for peace, he was seized and taken to Ghazna, from where he was sent to the court of

¹ T.N., p.120; Nizāmud-Dīn Ahmed, Tabaqat i Akbari, vol. I, p.37; Badayuni, vol. I, p.47; Yahyab-Ahmed b 'Abdullah Sirhindi, Tarikh-i Mubarak Shahi, p.6.

² T.N., p.121., In the Tarikh-i Mubarak Shahi, p.6., it is stated that Khusrau Malik presented only an elephant, and does not say that he also gave his son as hostage. Yahya is wrong as subsequent events show that he was, the Ghori ruler as a pledge; Badayuni, vol.I, p.47., T.A., vol. I., p.37.

³ T.N., p.121; Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi, p.7. Yahya says that as the days of the Ghaznavid's had become numbered, Khusrau Malik in spite of his strong army was unable to capture the fort.

Ghiyath u'd-Dīn at Fizūz koh, who had him imprisoned at the Castle of Balarwān and where in 1191 A.D., both Khusra Malik and his son Bahram were put to death.¹

Lāhore was captured and placed under the governorship of 'Ali-Karmākh in 1186 A.D. It provided Mu'izz al-Dīn the much sought for base for operating against the Hindu kingdoms across the Rāvī. About four years after, he began his operations against the Hindu Rājās of India. The capture of Lāhore had, perhaps, extended his south-eastern boundary up to the Sutlej, as in 1191 A.D., he captured Bhatinda within the kingdom of the Chauhān ruler Prithvirāj, and placed it under the command of Qādī Diya ud-Dīn Tulakī. A contingent of twelve hundred horse was provided to the qādī, and he was instructed to retain the captured territory for a period of eight months.²

As Mu'izz al-Dīn had no plan to advance any further, he decided to return. Before he could retrace his steps news reached

¹T.N., p.122. Muḥāj says that when Ghiyath al-Dīn and Mu'izz al-Dīn were preparing to encounter Sultan Shah of Khwarazm, Khusra Malik and his son Bahram were put to death. S.Lane-Poole, Mediaeval India, pp 48-49. Lane-Poole is right when he says that 'Mu'izz al-Dīn's first aim was to bring the Muhammadan provinces of India under his control - as Muhammadans held the strategic points, its occupation was indispensable to an invader whose object was to march into the heart of Hindūstan.

²T.N., p.118; Sir Wolseley Haig, op.cit, p.40; Adris Banerji, 'The Muslim occupation of northern India', 'Indian Culture', vol. IV (July 1937 - April 1938), p.506 says, "The annexation of the Punjab brought about a disastrous change in the political stage of India, because it exposed the Tomaras, the Chahamanas and the Gahadvalas to the constant attack of the Turks."

him that Prithvirāj, the ruler of Ajmīr, was advancing with a large army to recover the fortress of Bhatinda.¹ The danger to which Bhatinda now lay exposed being evident to Mu'izz al-Dīn, he was left with no choice but to defend it in spite of his unpreparedness for battle, and his much smaller army which was perhaps further reduced by the early dispersal of some of his troops. He turned round and encountered Prithvirāj at Tarāin near Karnāl, when the two wings of his army being overwhelmed by the huge size of the enemy's force retreated from the battlefield; but the centre division under his leadership resolutely stood up against all attacks of the enemy.²

In the engagement Mu'izz al-Dīn shattered two front teeth of Govind Rāe, the brother of Prithvirāj, but the latter also drove his javelin into the Sultān's arm and severely wounded him. The Sultān was about to fall from the saddle when a young Khalījī cavalryman sprang on his horse and took him to the spot where the remnant of his forces had halted.³ A litter was prepared on

¹ T.N., p.118; Muḥāj says that all the Rānās of Hind had joined Prithvirāj on this occasion; J. Briggs, op.cit. p.172, Firishta confidently gives the figure of Prithvirāj's army as two hundred thousand horsemen and thirty thousand elephants; Badāyūnī, Vol.I p.49, says, Rāe Pathaurā (Prithvirāj) arrived with a vast army; Tarikh-i-Mubarakshahi, p.8. Yahya says that Prithvirāj came with innumerable cavalry, Infantry and elephants.

² T.N., p.119.

³ T.N., p.119; T.A. Vol I, p.38; Badāyūnī Vol I, p.49

which he was carried to Ghazna. The fortress of Bhatinda was immediately besieged by Prithvirāj's army, and surrendered after thirteen months of resistance.¹

Smarting under the ~~hum~~iliation of his first major defeat in Northern India, Mu'izz al-Dīn passed restless days and nights and concentrated his whole energy on preparing for a return encounter. The following year, 1192 A.D., he returned with a cavalry force said to number 120,000 and met the same Rājput adversary once again on the battlefield of Tarāin.² With a view to bolstering the morale of his army and possibly, also, to demoralise the enemy, he despatched Qiwāmu'l Mulk Rukn-ud-Dīn Hamza in advance from Lahore to offer Prithvirāj the option of embracing Islām and acknowledging his supremacy. The Rājput chief, proud of his numerous soldiers and conscious of his previous victory, treated the offer with contempt and defiance. The battle commenced and Mu'izz al-Dīn by his superior generalship³ defeated the enemy. Govind Rāe was killed, while Prithvirāj tried

¹ T.N.p.119; T.A.Vol I, p.38; Badāyūnī, Vol I, p.50. Both Nizām ud-Dīn and Badāyūnī say that Prithvirāj took the fortress of Bhatinda after entering into negotiations with Diya ud-Dīn Tulakī, which is improbable.

² Taj ul ma'athir, I.O.1486, f.34a; J. Briggs, op.cit. p.173, Firishta informs us that Mu'izz al-Dīn, after being defeated, disgraced all those officers who had deserted him in battle. He compelled them to walk round the city of Ghor with their horses mouth-bags, filled with barley, hung about their necks, and forced them to eat the grain like brutes.

³ Taj ul ma'athir, I.O.1486, F.36a; where it said, "the size of Prithvirāj's army can not be conceived in the picture gallery of imagination". J. Briggs op.cit. p.175. Firishta says, 'one hundred and fifty princes joined Prithvirāj, and his army consisted of 300,000 horse, more than 3,000 elephant and a number of infantry; Tārikh-i-Mubarak Shāhī, p.9, where it is said "Mu'izz al Dīn divided his 40,000 cavalry into four equal sections and ordered them to attack the enemy from four different quarters", T.N.p.12

to escape on a horse but was pursued and taken captive near Sarsutī. Minhāj informs that he was put to death, but this may be the substance of the whole later account, as there is enough testimony to show that he survived and acknowledged Muslim suzerainty.¹

Hānsī, Kuhram and Sarsuti were captured and garrisoned.² Delhi and Ajmīr were also, reduced, but the shortage of man-power and the attending administrative problems made Mu'izz al-Dīn behave like a practical statesman. He allowed the son of Prithvirāj to rule at Ajmīr on promise of payment of tribute. Hasan Nizāmī says, Delhi was also assigned to a Hindū chief on the same condition. Mu'izz al-Dīn returned to Ghazna leaving Quth ud-Dīn as his representative in India, with Kuhram as his headquarters.³ He was

3(cont'd from previous page)

'Isāmī, p.71, Mu'izz al-Dīn had trained his horses to overcome their fear in the presence of huge elephants, by making them fight with dummy elephants.

¹Edward Thomas, Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Delhi, p.18, see specimen of the silver and copper coin No.15, with inscription "Prithvi, and Sri Muhammad Sam."

²T.N., p.120

³T.N., p.120; Taj ul Ma'athir, I.O. 1486, f 40b; V.A.Smith, Oxford history of India, p.220. Smith thus sums up the effect of the victory at the second battle of Tara'in. "In fact, the second battle of Tara'in in 1192 may be regarded as the decisive contest which ensured the ultimate success of the Muhammadan attack on Hindustan. All the numerous subsequent victories were merely consequences of the overwhelming defeat of the Hindū league on the historic plain to the north of Delhi".

empowered to deal as he liked with the Hindū chiefs, and also to extend the conquests. During the next two years Qutb u'd-Dīn had to contend with many a difficult situation. In 589 A.H./1193 A.D. when the Hindū chief Jātwan, perhaps a tributary of the Rājā of Nahrwāla, besieged the Muslim garrison at Hānsī, Qutb ud-Dīn rushed to their rescue. On his approach, the besiegers took to flight, but the Muslim army pursued them so closely that they were obliged to turn and enter into an engagement, which resulted in the defeat of the Hindū army, and the death of their leader.¹

After re-fortifying Hānsī, Qutb u'd-Dīn crossed the Jumna and occupied Baran² and Meerut, which came to serve as the base of operation, against the ruler of Qanauj and Benāres. In 589 A.H./1193 A.D., he occupied Delhi³ and made it the seat of his government. Soon after he had taken possession of Delhi, he was called upon to deal with Harivāj, the brother of Prithvirāj, who had captured Ajmīr after driving out Prithvirāj's son, and had also besieged Ranthamber, which was under Qiwām ul Mulk Rukn u'd-Dīn Hamza.⁴ On the arrival of Qutb u'd-Dīn the besiegers withdrew

¹ Taj ul-ma'athir, I.O. 1486, ff 55a, 64a, Sir Wolseley Haig, op.cit. p.41

² Habīb ul-Fah, op.cit., p.62, and Appendix 'A'.

³ T.N., p.120; T.A.^{vol.I}, pp.38-39.

⁴ Taj ul ma'athir, I.O. 1486, ff.70.

from both directions. Prithvirāj's son was re-instated, but Aybek could hardly take any effective step against them, as the attempt of the former ruler of Delhi to recapture his lost territory demanded his immediate attention there.¹

He returned and dealt with the situation with an iron hand. After defeating the Rāe his head was struck off and sent to Delhi to serve as a warning to his fellow-citizens.² Qutb u'd-Dīn soon had to leave for Ghazna on the summons of Mu'izz al-Dīn, and here he was detained for six months on account of illness.³ During his stay he received all honours and affection from his master, and when he was on his way back to Delhi, Taj u'd-Dīn Yalduz gave his daughter in wedlock to him.⁴ It seems Aybek had returned with instructions from his master to prepare the ground for the conquest of the powerful kingdom on the Ganges, as on his return towards the end of 1193 A.D., he attacked and captured Kol⁵ (modern 'Aligarh).

¹ Tāj ul ma'āthir, I.O. 1486,

f.72a, where it is said that Qutb ud-Dīn, on this occasion, conferred a robe on the son of Prithviraj, who in return gave abundant treasure, which included three golden melons resembling the full moon.

² Ibid. ff.72b, 73a.

³ Ibid. f74b-83a. According to Hasan Nizāmī, Qutb ud-Dīn was invited by Mu'izz al-Dīn in the summer of 1193 A.D., to receive thanks in person T.N., p.168. Minhaj says that after Qutb ud-Dīn visited Ghazna, after he had conquered Nahrwala, in 1197 A.D; Cf 'Iṣāmī, p.86 who says, 'In order to prove the untruthfulness of the courtiers, who had represented that Qutb ud-Dīn had become disloyal, Mu'izz al-Dīn called him to Ghazna concealed him under a bed-stead, and made his opponents repeat their allegations.

⁴ T.N., p.133; Tāj ul ma'āthir, I.O. 1486, f.846.

⁵ Tāj ul ma'āthir, I.O. 1486, ff 104a-105a.

The stage was now set for an attack on Jaychandra, the powerful Rājā of Benares and Qanauj. In fact his expulsion was the logical sequence of Muslim conquest, as otherwise their domination over northern India would remain incomplete.¹ In 1194 A.D., Mu'izz al-Dīn marched to Benāres at the head of fifty thousand horse, and met the Rathor army in the neighbourhood of Chandwār. After a hotly contested battle the Muslim army gained victory. Jaychandra lost his life, his body being so disfigured that it could be identified only by his golden teeth.²

The victors then marched to Benāres and Āsnī, and captured them with their fabulous treasures. Temples in the conquered territory were converted into mosques and colleges. Muslim conquest now extended to the border of Behār. The conquered territory was garrisoned and Malik Husām ud-Dīn Agh ul bak was appointed as its first governor.³

After Jaychandra's defeat Mu'izz al-Dīn returned to Ghazna. Qutb ud-Dīn once more found himself confronted with a formidable situation. Kol⁴ was besieged by a Rājput force which was relieved in 591 A.H./1195 A.D. Ajmīr was again under the menace of Harīraj, while an army commanded by Jhāt Rāe supposed to have been organised by Harīraj was proceeding to Delhī. In order to meet the situation, Aybek left a detachment at Delhī and himself proceeded to intercept Jhāt Rāe. The latter, on the advance of the

1 Ibn al Athīr, Kāmil ut-Tawārīkh, as quoted in History of India as told by its own historians, Vol. II, p. 251, Ibn al Athīr says about Jaychandra, "The king of Benares was the greatest king in India, and possessed the largest territory, extending length-wise from the borders of China to the province of Malwah, and in breadth from the sea to within ten days journey of Lahore."

2 'Isāmī, p. 91, says, Jaychandra was killed and could not be traced, seven hundred elephants were captured; T.N. p. 120. According to Minhāī, three hundred elephants fell in the hands of the Muslim army.

3 T.N. (ed. Chughtai), p. 60; Habib ullaḥ, op.cit. p. 64. Note 4 see over

Muslim army, took refuge in Ajmīr, where both he and Harīrāj were besieged by Qutb ud-Dīn. Harīrāj finding defeat inevitable immolated himself in fire.¹ As Prithvirāj's son had proved incapable of holding Ajmīr,² Aybek placed it under a Muslim officer.

In 592 A.H./1196 A.D., Mu'izz al-Dīn again returned to northern India and marched against Bayāna. Its ruler Kunwar Pāl, after a short siege, surrendered the city of Bayāna and the fortress of Thangīr to the invading army. These were assigned to the charge of Bahā ud-Dīn Tughril, who founded a city in the territory of Bayāna styled Sultānkot, to use it as a base for raids against adjacent territories.³ Mu'izz al-Dīn then advanced to Gwālīyūr and invested it, but raised the siege when its ruler Sulkana Pal sent ten elephants as a peace offering and promised to pay tribute.⁴

Hoping that tactics of encroachment would reduce Gwālīyūr to a difficult plight, Bahā ud-Dīn began to make regular incursions there from Sultānkot, and also from the fortification he had built at a

4 Tāj ul ma'āthir, I.O. 1486, f.125b. (note from previous page).

1 Ibid, ff 131b-136a; J. Briggs, op.cit., p.17 Firishta gives an interesting description of the Rajput soldiers, 'The Rajputs, if driven to desperation, murder their wives and children, set fire to their houses and property, let loose their hair, and rushing on the enemy, are heedless of death'; Habīb ullāh, op.cit. p.33, says "But the Rajput excelled the Turk in reckless bravery and a chivalrous sense of honour that led him to commit self-destruction rather than suffer defeat or go down in his own estimation."

2 Tāj ul ma'āthir, I.O. 1486, ff 136b-139b; J. Briggs, op.cit. p.194 Firishta says, 'Ajmir was restored to the Muhammadan government, and was afterwards ruled by its laws.'

3 T.N. (ed. Chughtai) pp.58-59.

4 Tāj ul ma'āthir, I.O. 1486, f.146b; Iṣāmī, p.80, says that Mu'izz al-Dīn returned the fort of Gwālīyūr on the intercession of the Rājā's daughter, who promised to have a mosque built inside the fort.

distance of two leagues from the Gwāliyūr fortress. As was expected, the defenders fell into despair and ultimately surrendered the fortress to Qutb ud-Dīn, whose relations with Bahā ud-Dīn were not cordial.¹

In the year 1196 A.D., the Turks had to face one of the most difficult situations so far encountered, when a body of the Mher tribe dwelling in the vicinity of Ajmīr resolved to expel the Muslim invaders from Rājputāna.² In order to implement their design they sought the alliance of other Rājput tribes. Since the Muslim garrison at Ajmīr was not adequate to meet the combined force of the Rājputs, re-inforcement was sought from Delhī. Aybek responded by immediately marching to Ajmīr, where he encountered the Mher forces which had assembled outside the city. The conflict continued the whole day; it was the next morning that a large Rājput army arrived from Nahrwāla to turn the tide of battle and resolve the issue.³ Aybek being seriously wounded withdrew to Ajmīr, the Rājputs holding the city in siege. The situation would have worsened, if news of the approach of armed assistance from Ghazna had not dispirited the Rājputs and made them retire.⁴

1 Fakhr-i Mudabbir, Tārīkh-i Fakhr ud-Dīn Mubārak Shāh, p. 24, The author dates the conquest of Gwāliyūr as 597 A.H./1201 A.D.; T.N. (ed. Chughtai), p.59.

2 Tāj ul ma'āthir, I.O. 1486, ff. 152a-153a.

3 Ibid, ff 153b-156a; R.C. Bramley, 'Ajmir-Merwara' Imperial Gazetteer of India, Vol.V. p.141, without quoting his authority, the author says that after the death of Qutb ud-Dīn, in 1210 A.D., the Mhers and the Solankis of Gujerāt (i.e. the Chalukīya Rājputs which composed the army of Nahrwāla), made a night attack on Taragarh, the fort commanding Ajmīr town, and massacred the Muhammadan garrison to a man. The shrine of Sayyid Hussain, the governor who perished in the attack, along with the tombs of his comrades stand in an enclosure known as ganj-i shahīdān or 'Treasury of Martyrs'.

4 Tāj ul ma'āthir, I.O. 1486, f 157a.

Aybek could hardly forget this treacherous attack. Early next year, 1197 A.D., he marched with a strong army against Nahrwāla. Its ruler, Bhīm Deo, on the approach of the Muslim army, retired to some far off fortress, leaving two chiefs, Rāe Karan and Darabaras, with a ¹ ~~huge~~ Rājput force at the foot of Mt. Abū to engage Aybek in battle. The Muslim army, deeming the situation unpropitious hesitated to take the initiative for this was the very spot where Mu'izz al-Dīn had suffered his first defeat. The Rājputs misconstrued this hesitation for cowardice and, abandoning the Pass, turned their faces towards the field for ² battle. On 13th Rabi'ul Awwal 593 A.H./5th January 1197 A.D., an obstinately contested battle continued from dawn to noon, ending in the complete defeat of the Rājputs.³

The accounts have it that nearly fifty thousand Rājputs were slain and twenty thousand were taken captives. Rāe Karan effected his escape leaving twenty eight elephants and cattle and arms of ⁴ all descriptions, as war booty to the Muslim army. The city of

1 Taj ul ma'athir, I.O. 1486, ff 157b-158a; Habib ullah, op.cit p.67. Habib ullah, on the basis of inscriptions, has Kelhana instead of Rāe Karan, and Dharavarsha in place of Darabars, J. Briggs, op.cit., p. 194, Firishta says, 'Jeewun Rāe, the general of Bhim Dew, gave battle to Qutb ud-Din'.

2 Taj ul ma'athir, I.O. 1486, ff. 158b-159a.

3 Ibid, ff. 159a - 162a.

4 Ibid, ff. 162a - 163a; Tārīkh-i-Fakhr ud-Dīn Mubārak Shāh, p.23, where it is said, 'besides other booty, thirty rare elephants were captured and sent to Sultān Mu'izz al-Dīn.

1

Nahrwāla was occupied. The victory was a retaliation for an earlier treacherous attack of the Mher tribe whom the army of Nahrwāla had supported, and it also avenged the early defeat of Mu'izz al-Dīn on the same battlefield.

Aybek next directed his campaigns against the country across the Upper Ganges. Fakhr-i Mudabbir informs us that in 594 A.H./1197-98 A.D., Badaūn was captured and the temples of Benares were destroyed; in 595 A.H./1198-99 A.D., Chantarwal? (Chandwar), and Qanauj were occupied; and in 596 A.H./1199 A.D.,
2
 Sirohī and Mālwah on the south of Delhī were conquered.

Subjugation of the southern frontier of Delhī, and elimination of the last major Rājput power, now formed Aybek's ultimate aim. In 599 A.H./1202 A.D. he attacked Kālinjar which was held by the powerful Chandel Rājā, named Pārmār.
3
 The Rājā, on being hard pressed, sued for peace and agreed to pay tribute, but before the provisions of the treaty could be given effect, he died, and his minister Āj Deo, depending on a newly discovered water supply, refused to abide by the peace terms. Hostilities were resumed, but after a few days all the reservoirs in the fort dried up, which compelled the garrison to surrender to the Muslim army. Hasan

1 Tāj ul ma'āthir, I.O. 1486, f.163a; J. Briggs, op.cit. p.197. Pirishta says that a Muslim officer was appointed to the government of Nahrwāla; M. Elphinstone, History of India, p.366; where it is said, 'Qutb ud-Dīn took and garrisoned the capital, and after ravaging the province returned to Delhī.'

2 Tārīkh-i Fakhr ud-Dīn Mubārak Shāh, p.24

3 Tāj ul ma'āthir, I.O. 1486, ff 165B-166a. According to Hasan Nizami, Iltmish was purchased about this time, and had joined the Kālinjar expedition.

Nizāmī says fifty thousand were taken slaves, and elephants, cattle and countless arms became the spoils of the victors.

Mahoba the capital of the Chandel Rājā was occupied and Hizbar ud-Dīn Hasan Arnāl was entrusted with the government of the territory.¹

While Aybek was busy obtaining victories in northern India, another soldier of fortune, a daring adventurer named Ikhtiyār ud-Dīn Muhammad Bakhtiyār Khaljī, was engaged in reducing the eastern provinces of Bengal and Behār for Mu'izz al-Dīn. His humble and unimpressive appearance stood in the way of getting employment either at Ghazna or at Delhī.² Without being thwarted, he proceeded to Badaūn in 1193 A.D., where its governor Hizbar ud-Dīn Hasan Adīb fixed a salary for him. After some time he went to Awadh where Husām ud-Dīn Aghulbak assigned him for his upkeep the villages of Bhagwat and Bhīulī, lying between the Ganges and the Karma-nasah river.³ From here he commenced his incursions into Behār and Muner and acquired much booty. When the fame of his bravery and fortune gained circulation, Khaljīs from different parts of India turned towards him and swelled the size of

1 Tāj ul ma'āthir, I.O. 1486, ff. 172b-175b.

2 T.N. (ed. Chughtāī) p.60.

3 T.N. (ed. Chughtāī), p.60. His edition has Sylhet and Sehlī, which are not traceable in the area of Awadh. According to Raverty, the names Bhagwat and Bhīulī found in the oldest copies of the Tabagāt-i Nasirī, are correct, and these, also, confirm the location of the area. Nizām ud-Dīn and Badayūnī, have Kampīla and Patīālī, which are three degrees north and the same distance west of the places mentioned in the oldest copies of the Tabagāt-i Nasirī.

his army. Emboldened by his unresisted early depredations, in 1197-98 A.D., he launched a final attack with two hundred horsemen on the southern parts of Behār and captured its capital Odantapurī with immense booty. The victims of his attack were the shaven-headed Buddhist monks dwelling in a College, who¹ were through mistake taken to be Brahmans. This conquest brought the Turks to the border of Lower Bengal.

Bakhtiyār Khaljī soon after this visited Aybek at Badaūn bringing rich presents, and he was greatly honoured and distinguished.² Within a year of his success in Behār, Bakhtiyār led a campaign against Nudīya, the capital of Lakshman Sen, the ruler of Bengal. Nudīya was then partly deserted on account of the panic created by the appearance of Muhammad Bakhtiyār Khaljī. The Muslim commander, initially, had set out with sufficient army, but when he entered Nudīya only eighteen horsemen were able to keep pace with him and these passed the city gates unchallenged, as the guards and inhabitants took them to be horse dealers. Reaching the gates of the palace, they

1 T.N. (ed. *Chughtāi*) pp. 60-61, where it is said that when Qutb ud-Dīn heard of Muhammad Bakhtiyār's deeds of valour, he sent him a robe and also conferred on him much honour; T.A. Vol.I, p.47; Ishwari Prasad, in *Medieval India*, p.126, says that Behār was then the only place in India where Buddhism existed, owing to the patronage of the kings of the Pala dynasty, who were staunch Buddhists.

2 *Tāj ul ma'āthir*, I.O. 146, ff 176b-177a, where it is said Muhammad Bakhtiyār was presented by Qutb ud-Dīn with a tent, a naubat, a drum, a standard, a magnificent robe of honour, a horse, trappings, a waist-band, a sword and vest from the royal wardrobe; T.N. (ed. *Chughtāi*), p.61, Minhaj says that Qutb ud-Dīn gave Muhammad Bakhtiyār, a rich robe of honour from his special wardrobe along with many other presents.

attacked the royal guards unawares, whose sudden hue and cry reached the ears of Lakshman Sen who was having his dinner
 1
 from his usual gold and silver dishes.

The apprehension of an inevitable disaster at the hands of a person of Bakhtiyār's features coupled with a surprise attack, unnerved Lakshman Sen to the extent that he lost all courage to offer resistance. Consequently, he fled bare-footed by the rear-gate of the palace leaving his women-folk and treasures at the mercy of the invaders. On the arrival of his whole army, Muhammad Bakhtiyār established control over the capital. Nudiya was subsequently abandoned by Bakhtiyār, and Lakhnouti was made the headquarters, as it was nearer his base in Behār and thus more suitable for extending his conquests. Lakshman Sen escaped to Vikrampur, some eight miles south-east of Dacca, from where he ruled over the remnant of his
 2
 kingdom.

1 T.N. (ed. Chughtai), pp. 63-64; 'Iṣāmī, pp. 95-96 says Muhammad Bakhtiyār entered Nudiya, situated on the left bank of the Bhagirathi, in the disguise of a horse-dealer.

2 T.N. (ed. Chughtai), pp. 63-64, Minhāj provides an interesting anecdote concerning the conquest of Lakhnouti. He says, - prior to the conquest of Lakhnouti a number of astrologers, wise men and counsellors, had told Rae Lakshman Sen that according to the books of the ancient Brahmins, his kingdom would be conquered by the Turks, and the aforesaid conquest was near at hand. When Rae Lakshman Sen enquired whether the conqueror had any particular sign, he was told that while standing the fingers of his hands would reach the calves of his legs. On investigation, these indications were found in Muhammad Bakhtiyār, which made the Brahmins and the money-lenders leave the place; H. Blochmann, 'Geography and History of Bengal', Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta 1873, Vol. XLII, p.211 n, Blochmann is of the opinion that though Lakshman Sen was called "king" he was not more than the principal zamindar of his time. This is not correct as Minhāj testifies to the sovereignty of his descendants even in the late thirteenth century.

The phenomenal success in the eastern parts of India, widened the range of Bakhtiyār's ambition and stirred him for another adventure in the north-east. He now planned to conquer Tibet and China famous for the export of horses into north Bengal. In spite of being unacquainted with the communications of his projected invasion he undertook his perilous enterprise with ten thousand horsemen, towards the later half of 1205 A.D.¹ A converted tribal chief named 'Alī the Mech offered to guide Muhammad Bakhtiyār through the hills. The Muslim commander arrived at Burdhankot from Lakhnoutī, and for ten days proceeded northwards along the river Bangmatī, whose size according to Minhāj, was in all respects three times that of the river Ganges. When the army reached a spot where there was a stone bridge spanning a river, Muhammad Bakhtiyār posted at the head of the bridge, a detachment under two officers, a Khaljī and a Turk, for guarding it, and then proceeded onwards.

In the meantime, the advice sent by the Rājā of Kāmṛp to postpone the expedition until next year, when he would himself assist with his forces to cause the subjugation of that territory, produced little impression on Bakhtiyār.² After a

1 T.N. (ed. Chughtai) pp. 65, 66. Chughtai's edition has 'tang-basta' (tightly tied) horses, whereas Raverty, Vol. I, p. 567, has 'tangahan' horses, which were brought from Karmattan to be sold into Lakhnoutī.

2 T.N. (ed. Chughtai), p. 65.

most arduous passage through river, de files, passes and mountains, the Muslim army reached the open country of Tibet on the sixteenth day, where the exhausted force was engaged in a fierce battle by the local garrison, who were supported by the inhabitants of the adjacent areas. Though the conflict was indecisive, Minhaj says, 'a number of Muslim lives were lost'. Later, when Muhammad Bakhtiyār learnt from his prisoners that a force of fifty thousand mounted archers from 'Karambattan' were on the way to confront his worn-out army, he decided to retreat and return next year for its conquest.

While returning Bakhtiyār found that the inhabitants had destroyed all vegetation on the retreating route, which compelled his soldiers to live on the flesh of horses. The bridge by which the army had crossed had been demolished by the Hindūs of Kāmṛūp, as the officers posted by Bakhtiyār for its protection, had quarrelled among themselves and abandoned it. The Muslim army thereupon took shelter in a temple to construct rafts for crossing the river, but they were soon besieged by the Kāmṛūp forces. With a concerted

1 T.N. (ed. Chughtai), p.66; T.A. Vol.I, p.49.

2 T.N. (ed. Chughtai), pp.67, 68; T.A. Vol.I, p.49. According to Nizām ud-Dīn, "Muhammad Bakhtiyār found that two arches of the bridge were broken".

attack Muḥammad Bakhtiyār and his men fought their way out of the temple and reached the bank of the river, where they were left with the only choice of jumping into it to swim ashore. As the river was deep and its current very swift most of his men were washed away, and only a small number of horsemen along with Muḥammad Bakhtiyār could reach the opposite bank. From here he returned to Dīwkot, where, overwhelmed with grief, he lay sick and bed-ridden until the knife of one of his lieutenants 'Alī Mardān Khaljī, rescued him¹ from his mental agony in 1206 A.D. Sir Wolseley Haig has rightly said that 'It was one of the greatest disasters for the arms of Islām when the entire Muslim army was annihilated; it would have been better for Muḥammad Bakhtiyār if he had² perished with them'.

Mu'izz al-Dīn, after the occupation of Bayana in 1195-96 A.D., remained pre-occupied with the affairs of Central Asia. On the death of his brother Ghiyāth al-Dīn, he ascended the throne of Ghor in 1203 A.D. In 1205 A.D. he suffered a

1 T.N. (ed. Chughtai) pp. 68, 69; T.A. Vol.I, pp.48 Nizām ud-Dīn's statement that Muḥammad Bakhtiyār, after the conquest of Lakhnautī, assumed the canopy, and had the khutbah read, and coin struck in his own name, is not correct as according to Minhāj, the latter even in his last days would affirm his allegiance to Mu'izz al-Dīn, by saying 'perhaps some calamity has visited Mu'izz al-Dīn, that good fortune has forsaken me'.

2 Sir Wolseley Haig, op.cit., p.50; T.N. (ed. Chughtai), p.68, Minhāj says, 'After returning to Dīwkot, whenever Muḥammad Bakhtiyār would go out in the streets he would have to hear the lament and reproaches of the wives and children of those whom he had led to their death'.

1

severe defeat at Andkhud, which shattered his military prestige in India, and encouraged the forces of disorder to rise in revolt on the rumour of his death. The Khokars dwelling between Lāhore and Ghazna, commenced plundering and harrying the districts around them. Hasan Nizami's statement that Aybek-Bak, a confidential servant of Mu'izz al-Dīn, relying on the rumour of the Sultān's death flew like a wind to Multān and occupied the city, and that the Khokars also believed in Mu'izz al-Dīn's death because of the act of Aybek-Bak, is accepted by Firishṭa but is not mentioned by Minhāj and other subsequent historians.

2

Mu'izz al-Dīn had returned a defeated prince to Ghazna, and as such he was burning for revenge on the Khwārazm Shahs, but the serious situation in India made him alter his plan, and led him to proceed first against the Khokars. He sent a message to Qutb ud-Dīn to join him on the Jhelum, and he himself set out

3

1 Tāj ul ma'āthir, I.O. 1486, ff 178; Barthold, op.cit., p.350.

2 Tāj ul ma'āthir, I.O. 1486, ff 179a-180a; J. Briggs, op.cit., p.182. Firishṭa gives the name of the officer as 'Zeeruk', and says that Mu'izz al-Dīn before taking action against the Khokars, marched against the usurper and took him prisoner.

3 Barthold, op.cit. p.352.

1

from Ghazna on October 20, 1205 A.D. Proceeding through Peshāwar he made a surprise attack on the enemy. The Khokars severely contested the battle between the Jhelum and the Chenab but with the arrival of the army under Qutb ud-Dīn they were completely overwhelmed. Many of the Khokars were killed and captured, while those who escaped to the jungle suffered a more miserable fate as the forest was set
2
on fire.

Having satisfactorily dealt with the Khokar menace, Mu'izz al-Dīn proceeded to Lāhore, reaching there on February 25, 1206 A.D. Once arrived, he permitted his troops to return to their homes and enjoy rest, because they were soon to move again for settling scores with the Khwarāzm Shāhs. Having allowed Qutb ud-Dīn to return to Delhī, he left for Ghazna. On the way he halted at Damyak, on the bank of the Indus where, while offering evening prayers, he was slain by assassins
3
on March 15, 1206 A.D.

1 Tāj ul ma'āthir, I.O. 1486, f 182b; Barthold, op.cit., p.352; Juwaynī, Tarikh-i Jahan Gusha, Vol.II, p.58. According to Juwaynī, Mu'izz al-Dīn's purpose in giving priority to his Indian campaign, was to replenish his treasury and to put his army in order.

2 Sir Woleeley Haig, op.cit., p.48; Habīb ullah, op.cit. p.77.

3 Tāj ul ma'āthir, I.O. 1486, ff.197a-198a; Badāyuni, Vol.I, p.53, says that some mischief-makers out of jealousy accused Imām Fakhr ud-Dīn Rāzī of being a conspirator in the murder of Mu'izz al-Dīn, because one day while addressing the Sultān during his weekly sermon, of which he had got very wearied, had said, 'Oh! Sultān Mu'izz al-Dīn some time hence, neither will this greatness and glory of yours remain, nor the flattery and hypocrisy of Rāzī; T.N., p.124.

There are conflicting opinions on the identity of the¹ assassins. Some held that the Khokars were guilty of the crime, while others are of opinion that the ²Mulāhidas, a heretical sect who were very hostile to Mu'izz al-Dīn, had a direct hand in it. The Mulāhidas had no doubt suffered at the hands of Mu'izz al-Dīn, but it is less possible that they shadowed him desperately for his destruction. The Khokars are more probable, because they had grievously suffered most recently for which the fire of vengeance must have been fiercely burning in their hearts.

Muslim power in India sustained a severe blow by the death of Mu'izz al-Dīn,² but it came at a time when most of his work in India was practically accomplished. By 1206 A.D., the Turks were masters of the territory ranging from Peshāwar to Assam. The need for providing more lands and subsistence for the emigrants from Central Asia, caused by Mongol irruption, was partly fulfilled. Gold for economic measures was considerably replenished, and the dreams of Muhammad bin Qāsim and Maḥmūd of Ghazna of a political invasion of India were

1 Juwaynī, op.cit., p.59. He says that the assassins were Hindūs, who attacked Mu'izz al-Dīn when he was having his nap.

2 Tāj ul ma'āthir,^{10.1486} ff. 197; 'Iṣāmī, p.97; T.N., p.124; Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p.12.

realised to a great extent. Elphinstone thus sums up the Indian conquests of Mu'izz al-Dīn:- "At his death Shahāb ud-Dīn held in different degrees of subjection the whole of Hindostān Proper, except Mālwa¹ and some contiguous districts, Sindh and Bengal were either entirely subdued or in rapid course of reduction. On Gujerāt he had no hold except what is implied in the possession of the capital. Much of Hindostan was immediately under his officers and the rest under dependent or at least tributary princes. The desert and some of the mountains were left independent from neglect."

Qutb ud-Dīn Aybek 1206 - 1210

Mu'izz al-Dīn had no son, but he had trained a band of slaves, who during his life-time had convinced him that they would carry to a successful conclusion the work he had initiated in India.² His sudden death brought to the surface the knotty problem of succession, and also threatened the various parts of his kingdom.

1 History of India, p. 368; Cf. Ishwari Prasad, Medieval India p.132, who says that 'from humble beginnings the kingdom of Delhi gradually developed into one of the greatest empires of the east'; Barthold, op.cit., p.338, says that 'Ghiyāth al-Dīn and Shihāb ud-Dīn (Mu'izz al-Dīn) raised their kingdom to the rank of a world power'.

2 T.N., p.132, Minhāj says that Mu'izz al-Dīn's prophesy that his slaves would take care of the kingdom after him, has been true up until the time the Tabaqāt-i-Nāsiri was written.

Khwarazm Shāh was left free to extend his authority beyond the Hindukush. The Khokars and other Hindu chiefs had been defeated but not crushed, and they could, therefore, always prove a source of trouble to the infant Muslim State. Tāj ud-Dīn Yalduz, the governor of Kirmān, having succeeded Mu'izz al-Dīn at Ghazna, was claiming sovereignty over the entire possession of his master. Qutb ud-Dīn Aybek, undoubtedly the ablest commander of Mu'izz al-Dīn, had not only conquered territories on behalf of his master, but had also acted as his representative in India.¹ His right to succeed to the Indian possessions of his late master was more legitimate than that of anyone else. Qutb ud-Dīn had, also, strengthened his position by matrimonial alliances with the powerful Mu'izzī nobles.²

Although a contemporary account states that Mu'izz al-Dīn, prior to his death, had nominated Qutb ud-Dīn as his successor,³ the question of succession in India was really decided when

1 Barthold, op.cit., p.352, says that Ghiyāth ud-Dīn Maḥmūd, the ruler of Ghar, acknowledged Khwarazm Shāh as his overlord in December 1206 A.D., and read the Khutba and coined money in Muhammad's name; Tārīkh-i-Fakhr ud-Dīn Mubārak Shāh, p.22. Qutb ud-Dīn's first headquarters was at Kuhram. The author Fakhr-i-Mudabbir says that it was an auspicious assignment, as the compound word 'Kuh-rām' 'mountain and rendering to obedience' indicated that the mountain with all the wealth of Hindustān would be subservient to his authority.

2 T.N. pp. 133, 141, 142, Qutb ud-Dīn was the father-in-law of Iletmish, and Nāsir ud-Dīn Qubācha, and the son-in-law of Tāj ud-Dīn Yalduz.

3 Tārīkh-i Fakhr ud-Dīn Mubārak Shāh, p.28; Tāj ul ma'āthir, I.O. 1486, f. 164b, where we read that the kingly rank of Qutb ud-Dīn was further elevated by Mu'izz al-Dīn.

Ghiyāth ud-Dīn Maḥmūd, the nephew and nominal successor of Mu'izz al-Dīn, despatched to Qutb ud-Dīn a canopy of state, and the title of Sultān.

It was after this investiture that Qutb ud-Dīn could ascend the throne at Lahore, on June 24, 1206 A.D. His period of rule being short, owing to premature death, he could not, therefore, conquer new territories¹. Besides, it was necessary for him to remain alert of the developments in the north-west. After accession, his only battle engagement was with his father-in-law, Tāj ud-Dīn Yalduz, as the latter was loth to see his authority superseded by the son-in-law.

Since Nāṣir ud-Dīn Qubācha had acknowledged the sovereignty of Qutb ud-Dīn, Tāj ud-Dīn Yalduz led an army against Qubācha in 1208 A.D., and drove him from Multān. Qutb ud-Dīn took this aggression as a challenge to his authority; he therefore marched against Yalduz, defeated the latter, and forced him to retreat to Kirmān.²

Aybek then moved to Ghazna and occupied it for a period of forty days, when he gave himself up entirely to pleasure and revelry. Minhāj says, as Qutb ud-Dīn neglected his responsibilities on account of his merriments and debauchery, the people became disgusted with him and invited Tāj ud-Dīn Yalduz

1 T.N. p. 140; Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī, p.14, Yahya Sirhindī includes a dur bash, with the canopy of state and the title of Sultān; T.A. Vol.I, p.42.

2 T.N., p.134, T.A. Vol.I, p.42; Badāyūnī, Vol.I, p.55

to return. Complying with promptness, Yalduz appeared at Ghazna and took Qutb ud-Dīn by surprise and the latter, finding¹ himself unprepared, fled to Lāhore without resistance.

At Lakhnoutī, after the murder of Muḥammad Bakhtiyār, the Khaljis imprisoned his assassin, 'Alī Mardān, and elected Muḥammad Shīrān as their new chief. 'Alī Mardān escaped from prison and reached Delhī where he persuaded Qutb ud-Dīn to² intervene in the affairs of Lakhnoutī.

Qaymāz Rumī was despatched from Awadh for this purpose. On gaining success he appointed Husām ud-Dīn 'Iwād Khaljī to the government of Lakhnoutī with headquarters at Dīwkot. Subsequently Qutb ud-Dīn conferred the territory of Lakhnoutī on 'Alī Mardān Khaljī, who remained subordinate to Delhī until the³ former's death.

While playing polo, Aybek fell from his horse and the high pommel of his saddle pierced into his breast, which caused his⁴ immediate death in 1210 A.D., at Lāhore.

¹ T.N. pp.135,136, Minhāj says, 'On this occasion no battle took place as both were conscious of their delicate relationship; T.A. Vol.I, p.43; In Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p.15, we read that Qutb ud-Dīn Aybek withdrew from Ghazna because the people were in favour of Taj ud-Dīn Yalduz.

² T.N., pp.157-158; T.A., Vol.I, p.51; Nizām ud-Dīn says that 'Alī Mardān won over Bābā Kotwal Isfahānī, the prison warden, and escaped to Delhī.

³ T.N., p.159.

⁴ T.N., p.140, T.A., Vol.I, p.43.

The sovereignty of Qutb ud-Dīn gave a new political frontier and a separate identity to the Delhi Sultanate. It was no longer a part of the kingdom of Ghazna or subordinate to it.

B The Delhi Sultanate

Iletmish (1210 - 1236 A.D.)

On Aybek's death in 1210 A.D., the amirs and maliks at Lahore in order to avoid disturbances in the country, usually arising when the throne was vacant, selected Ārām Shāh,¹ the son of Qutb ud-Dīn as ruler. His nomination was not supported at Delhi, where Sipah-sālār 'Alī Ismā'īl the Amīr-i-dād, and other nobles invited Iletmish, the governor of Badaūn and the son-in-law of Aybek, to come and ascend the throne at Delhi, which he accordingly did in 1210 A.D. The contemporary accounts do not state how long Ārām's reign lasted, but Minhāj and 'Isāmī both say that he died soon after.²

The new ruler was the son of Īlam Khān, a chief of one of the clans of the Ilbarī tribe of Turkestan. While young he was sold into

¹ T.N., p.141, T.A., Vol.I, p.55. Nizām ud-Dīn confidently says that Ārām Shāh was Qutb ud-Dīn's son. (Ārām Shāh ke be-ghair azu pīsar na-dash) "He had no son other than Ārām Shāh." Badayuni, in Vol.I, p.60 and 'Isāmī, in p.102, also say that Ārām was the son of Qutb ud-Dīn. The contemporary works, Tāj ul ma'āthir and Tārīkh-i Fakhṛ ud-Dīn Mubarak Shāh, do not even mention the name of Ārām Shāh; 'Abdul Haqq Dehlawi, Tārīkh-i Haqqī, B.M., Or.26,210,f.8a; 'Abdul Haqq is incorrect in saying that Iletmish was raised to the throne, by general agreement of the nobles.

² T.N., p.141; 'Isāmī, p.102; The sixteenth and seventeenth century historians, Badayuni, Nizām ud-Dīn and Firishṭa, say that Ārām Shāh encountered Iletmish, and was defeated. Minhāj does not describe any battle between Iletmish and Ārām, and indicates that the enthronement of Ārām was a temporary arrangement, which appears to be true, as the contemporary authorities, Hasan Nizāmī and Fakhṛ-i-Mudabbir, have completely ignored the short reign of Ārām.

slavery by his cousins. After his purchase by Qutb ud-Dīn at Delhi, his ability endeared him to his master, and this secured for him the governorship of Gwālīyūr, Baran and Badāun. He was manumitted under the orders of Mu'izz al-Dīn in 1206 A.D.¹

After his enthronement he contended successfully with the Mu'izzī nobles who, considering themselves his seniors, were reluctant to recognize him as their sovereign.² On accession, his kingdom embraced simply a portion of Aybek's extensive dominion. 'Alī Mardān had assumed independent sovereign status at Lakhnautī and was behaving like a world ruler, Qubācha had extended his dominions to include Multān, Uchch, Bhatinda, Kuhrām, Sarsutī and Lāhore,³ Yalduz still supposed himself to be Mu'izz al-Dīn's successor and therefore claimed sovereignty over his master's Indian conquests. The Hindū chiefs, also, had won back many of their strongholds. Kālinjar, Jalor, Ranthambor, Gwālīyūr, Mandawar and Thangīr, had been recovered by them.

Iletmish approaching his problems with caution, overcame all of them. He first restored peace in the eastern districts of Delhi where some Turkish nobles had shown signs of hostility towards him.

¹ T.N., pp.166-70; Cf. 'Iṣāmī, p.90, who says, 'Mu'izzal-Dīn, himself gave Iletmish his letter of manumission.'

² Tāj ul ma'āthir, I.O. 1486, ff.212b,213a. Hasan Nizāmī conveys that Iletmish was at first reluctant but, subsequently, decided to march against the jāndārs, T.N., p.170.

³ T.N., pp.159-60, 142, 143.

He even accepted royal insignia from the self-styled overlord, Yalduz.¹ Iletmish kept on consolidating his authority and by the time political developments in the Delhi Sultanate reached the state where his intervention was necessary, he proved himself equal to the situation. In 1215-16 A.D. when Yalduz, on the approach of Khwārazm Shāh, retired towards Lāhore, and having expelled Qubācha from there made some ridiculous demands on Iletmish, as he considered him his vassal, he found the ruler of Delhi ready to explode the myth of the former's overlordship. In reply to the demand, Iletmish marched with a strong force and decisively defeated Yalduz near Sāmāna, in 1215-1216 A.D. Yalduz was taken prisoner and sent to Badaūn, where he was put to death.² For Iletmish, it was an important victory as it eliminated a formidable obstacle to the independence of the Delhi Sultanate.

After Iletmish returned to Delhi, Qubācha restored the status quo ante by occupying Lāhore. Iletmish, who was now strong enough to annul the usurpation, marched against Qubācha in 1218 A.D. and occupied the whole of the Upper Punjab,³ where he installed his eldest son Nāsīr ud-Dīn Mahmūd as the governor.⁴

¹ T.N., p.170.

² Tāj ul ma'āthir, I.O. 1486, ff.230b-232b, 238a; T.N., p.171.

³ Tāj ul ma'āthir, I.O. 1486, ff.243b-247b.

⁴ Tāj ul ma'āthir, I.O., 1486, f.248a.

Qubācha remained in possession of the Lower Punjāb, Multān and Sind, for sometime, but the same deluge that had overwhelmed Yalduz in 1215-16 A.D. overtook him in 1221 A.D. The Mongols, having rolled up the Khwarazm Shāhī empire, were now launching relentless onslaughts on Islāmic kingdom in the East. The fugitive prince Jalāl ud-Dīn on being pursued by Chengīz Khān, crossed into the Punjāb¹ and advanced within two or three days journey from Delhi², from where he sent the following message to Iletmish, through his messenger, 'Ayn ul mulk.³ "The vicissitudes of fortune have established my right to approach thy presence, and guests of my sort arrive but rarely. If, therefore, the drinking place of friendship be purified upon either side and the cups of fraternity filled to the brim (muvaḥḥa), and we bind ourselves to aid and assist one another in weal and woe, then shall all our aims and objects be attained; and when our opponents realise the concord that exists between us, the teeth of their resistance shall be blunted".

1 T.N., p.171, Minhāj says that Jalāl ud-Dīn Khwarazm Shāh had advanced up to the limits of Lahore. Cf. H.H. Howorth, History of the Mongols, pt.I, p.90, who says 'Chengīz Khān, on hearing that the Khwarazmī prince had fled to the Indus, left a governor at Ghazna and marched in that direction. Jalāl ud-Dīn thereupon retired towards Delhi; Barthold, op.cit. pp. 445, 446.

2 Juwaynī, op.cit. pp. 144-145 says, Jalāl ud-Dīn relying on the saying that the noble have a place for the noble, requested Iletmish to assign him a place where he could remain for a few days.

3 J.A. Boyle, History of the World Conqueror, Vol.II, p.413. I have quoted verbatim the translation of Boyle.

Iletmish had certainly not forgotten the difficulties of his benefactor (Mu'izz al-Dīn) at Andkhūd in 1205 A.D., and besides, as a prudent ruler, he could not ignore the danger of sheltering a fugitive of the Mongols; so he not only refused to comply with the request, but also had the emissary murdered.¹ It was done without doubt to please the Mongol chief, Chengiz Khān, who was sweeping over Central and Western Asia like an irresistible avalanche. His wise step, no doubt, succeeded in saving the Delhī Sultanate from getting involved in the first onrush of the Mongol invasion; but it provoked the wrath of Jalāl ud-Dīn,² who made incursions into the Punjāb in order to avenge his insult.

Minhāj says that Iletmish marched with an army against him but no engagement took place as Jalāl ud-Dīn turned his attention towards Qubācha.³

Jalāl ud-Dīn settled for sometime in the vicinity of Lāhore, at a place called 'Balālah and Nakālah', and contracted marriage with the daughter of the Chief of the Salt Range. From there he

1 Juwaynī, op.cit., p.145, says Iletmish was willing to accommodate Jalāl ud-Dīn in the region of Delhi; Raverty, Translation of the Tabaqāt-i-Nāsiri Vol.I, p.293, n.5, Raverty quotes an anonymous author, who says, "The Sultān's envoy was put to death (some say he had been poisoned), under pretence that the envoy had been conspiring against him (Iletmish), but in reality fearing the effect upon his own Turkish followers and probably the Sultān's superiority over himself, his war-like character, his nobility of mind and great energy."

2 T.N., p.171; Juwaynī, op.cit., p.146.

3 T.N., p.171; Raverty, op.cit., p.294, n.5. Raverty refuses to accept that an army was sent against Jalāl ud-Dīn.

sent an expedition under Oz-Beg Tae against Qubācha, which completely surprised the latter's army at Uchch. Being routed, Qubācha fled to the island-fortress of Bhakkar, and from there to Multān. Having extorted a considerable sum of money from Qubācha as tribute, Jalāl-ud-Dīn returned to the Salt Range during¹ the hot season.

In 1224 A.D., when news reached Jalāl-ud-Dīn that the Mongols were again in pursuit of him, he moved towards Lower Sind. While passing by Multān he demanded of Qubācha, through his agent, a contribution known as 'shoe-money', but as the latter knew that the Mongols were on the heels of the Khwārazmī prince, he not only refused to pay, but also showed himself prepared for² hostility. After an hour's skirmish, Jalāl-ud-Dīn moved towards Uchch where, the people demonstrating defiance, he halted for³ two days, set fire to the city, and went to Sadūsān near the Indus. Fakhr ud-Dīn Salārī, the governor of Qubācha at Sadūsān surrendered the city to Jalāl-ud-Dīn after a short siege, but it was restored to

1 Juwaynī, op.cit., pp. 146-147; Howorth, op.cit., p.91, who says, Chengiz Khan left the Indus before the summer of 1221 A.D., as he feared its deadly heat would destroy his army; Barthold, op.cit., p. 453, who, basing his conclusion on the statement of Minhaj, correctly gives the end of February or early March 1222, as the probable period of Chengiz Khan's return from the Indus.

2 Juwaynī, op.cit., p.147, uses the term 'na'l bahā'(shoe-value), Cf. Boyle, op.cit., p.415 and n.14, who calls it 'shoe-money', a tribute which a king exacted from the ruler of a place in passing by, being the price of the shoes of the horse on which he was riding at the time; Sir Sayyid Ahmed, Qadīm nizām-i dehi-i Hindūstān, p.20, where it is said that in India the zamindars used to collect travelling charge known as 'Hath hifai' and Khak urai. The former was realised from the 'pedestrians' because they 'moved their hands' while travelling, and the latter from 'travellers on vehicle', as they 'raised the dust' of the territory.

3 Juwaynī, op.cit., p.147.

him after a morth, when Jalāl ud-Dīn moved further south to Debāl, Damrilah and Chatisar. He encamped near Debāl and Damrilah, from where he sent an expedition under Khaṣṣ Khān against Nahrwāla, the capital of Gujerāt, and acquired much booty. He also built a Jāmi'masjid on the site of a temple at Debāl. Jalāl ud-Dīn left India in 1224 A.D., on receiving the news that his presence was solicited in 'Iraq.

Qubācha, now a crippled power, did not take long to succumb to Iletmish. In 1228 A.D., a two-pronged attack by Iletmish and Malik Naṣīr ud-Dīn Aytemur, the governor of Lāhore, made Qubācha flee once again to the fortress of Bhakkar, where also a force was despatched under Nizām ul Mulk Kamāl ud-Dīn Muhammad Junaidī, the wazīr of Iletmish.

On the fall of Uchch, Qubācha despatched his son 'Alā ud-Dīn Mas'ūd Bahram Shāh to Iletmish with the offer of peace, but in the meantime the news of the capitulation of Bhakkar broke his heart and made him drown himself in the Indus, in May 1228 A.D. Qubācha's death removed another obstacle to Delhi's sovereignty, and brought Lower Sindh under Iletmish's effective authority.

1 Juwayni, pp. 148-149; Raverty, op.cit., p.295, n.5.

2 T.N., p.172.

3 Ibid., p.173.

4 Tāj ul ma'athir, I.O. 1486, f. 241b, Hasan Nizāmī says that Qubācha was a tributary prince, and because he had not maintained a correct account, Iletmish marched against him; Khwand Amir, Habīb us-Siyar, B.M. Add. 27,237, Vol. II, f 476a.

Malik Sinān ud-Dīn, the ruler of Debāl, personally came to¹ the capital to acknowledge Iletmish as his sovereign.

Jalāl ud-Dīn's successor, Saif ud-Dīn Ḥasan Qarlugh who occupied Banṭyān, the western part of the Salt Range, was however left undisturbed to act as a buffer between the Mongols and the Delhī Sultānate.

From 1225 A.D., after Jalāl ud-Dīn's departure, Iletmish could give his attention to the problems of the East. 'Alī Mardān's hysterical rule of two years was brought to an end² by his officers in 1211 A.D., when he was murdered and replaced by Husam ud-Dīn 'Iwaḍ Khalji. Finding Iletmish pre-occupied with the situation in the North, Husam ud-Dīn assumed the title of Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-Dīn, and considerably strengthened his authority by annexing Behār and receiving tributes from the neighbouring Hindū states of Jājnagar, Tirhut, Bang and Kāmṛup.

In 1225 A.D., Iletmish resolved on re-asserting Delhī's authority on Lakhnoutī, as it had existed in the reign of Qutb-ud-Dīn. He, therefore, marched against 'Iwaḍ but an agreement was concluded without a showdown. 'Iwaḍ agreed to relinquish Behār and acknowledge Iletmish as his suzerain. He also presented the Sultān eighty lakhs in treasure and thirty-eight elephants. Behār was placed under Malik 'Alā ud-Dīn Jānī.³

1 T.N. p.173.

2 Ibid. p.160. Minhāj calls 'Alī Mardān, a blood-shedder and murderer.

3 Ibid, p.163; T.A. Vol.I, p.54.

The condition of being a vassal must have seriously undermined 'Iwaḍ's position before his tributaries and he, therefore, repudiated the agreement within a year, drove out the governor from Behār and again established his independence.

As Iletmish was busy with operations against the Rājputs in the Siwālik territory, he asked his eldest son Nāṣir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd, the governor of Awadh, to take appropriate measures against 'Iwaḍ. In 1227 A.D., when 'Iwaḍ was away on an expedition against the rulers of Kāmṛp and Bang, who it seems had withheld tribute, Maḥmūd, seizing the opportunity, came and occupied Lakhnoutī. 'Iwaḍ returned and gave battle but was defeated and killed. ¹ A large booty with many Khaljī Amīrs were captured. Maḥmūd now held Lakhnoutī, but after his death towards the end of 1229 A.D., the Khaljīs under the leadership of Balkā Malik Khaljī again seized Lakhnoutī and defied Delhī's authority. Balkā was, however, slain in a campaign led by Iletmish himself in 628 A.H./1231 A.D., and 'Alā ud-Dīn Jānī was appointed to the government of Lakhnoutī. ²

1 T.N., p.164; Cf. "Iṣāmī, p.119, who says, 'Iwaḍ's head was struck off in the battle; Nusakh-i Jahan Āra, B.M. Or.141, f 119a.

2 T.N., p.174; Cf. J. Horovitz, 'The inscriptions of Muḥammad Ibn Sam, Qutb ud-Dīn Aybek and Iletmish', Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica, 1911-12, p.24, who says that the title of Iletmish's eldest son, Nāṣir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd, according to the inscription was 'Malik ush Sharq', when he was governor of the eastern provinces. His tomb in Malikpur is known as that of the 'Sultān-i-Gharī', because he lies buried in a vaulted crypt.

So long as danger threatened the Delhi Sultanate the Hindū chiefs to the south of Delhi were also active in recovering their territories. To allow the subdued enemy to revive would be to imperil the existence of the recently established Muslim power. So from 1226 A.D., Iltutmish¹ exerted himself against them and succeeded in re-capturing Ranthambor, Mandawar, Jalor and Thangir. In 1232 A.D., Gwalīyūr was besieged; its ruler, Malak Deo, son of Basīl, withstood the siege for eleven months, but ultimately, being unable to sustain the pressure, escaped one night leaving the fortress in the hands of eight hundred defenders who, without resistance, surrendered the following morning to the invaders, to be severely punished.²

Kālinjar, which had received a shattering blow at the hands of Qutb ud-Dīn, had since revived. Malik Nuṣrat ud-Dīn Taysāl led an attack against it in 1234 A.D., his only success being the capture of the Rāja's standard, canopy of state, and other

1 T.N., p.172, Minhāj says that in the past, seventy kings had unsuccessfully attempted the conquest of Ranthambor; Tāj ul ma'athir, I.O. 1486, f.70a; Tārīkh-i-Fakhr ud-Dīn Mubarak Shāh p.22. According to both of these contemporary works, Ranthambor was conquered in the reign of Mu'izz al-Dīn.

2 T.N., p.175; T.A. Vol. II, pp. 60,61. Nizām ud-Dīn says that a large number of men were taken prisoners at Gwalīyūr, out of which three hundred were executed. Tāj ud-Dīn Reza, the secretary, wrote a quatrain on its conquest which is carved on a stone on the gate of the fort. (See Appendix 'B'). In the Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica, op.cit., p.24, we read that an inscription recording the conquest of Gwalīyūr in 630 A.H./1233 A.D., had existed on the gate of the fort, but no traces of it are now left.

booty which, according to Minhāj, was considerable. While returning through the defiles he was attacked by Rāna Chahār of Ajār whom he overcame only with much difficulty.¹

In 1235 A.D., Iletmish planned to enlarge his conquests. Fakhr-i-Mudabbir says that Mālwah was conquered by Qutb ud-Dīn in 1199 A.D., but some modern scholars are inclined to doubt the authenticity of this statement.² The demolition of a temple at Bhīlsa, said to have been three hundred years old, suggests that the first blow at Mālwah was struck by Iletmish in 1235 A.D. It is very improbable that such a place, where the Hindūs were known to have used as a repository for their gold and other precious objects, would have been left standing had Qutb ud-Dīn pillaged this place at the time stated. This was followed by the capture of the city of Bhīlsa. To shatter the Hindu power of resistance and also to capture more gold, Iletmish continued his triumphal march to Ujjain, to the south-west of Bhīlsa, where he destroyed the famous temple of Mahākāl Deo and carried off to Delhī the image of Vikramaditya.³

1 T.N. pp. 240-242.

2 Tārīkh-i Fakhr ud-Dīn Mubārak Shāh, p.24; Habīb ullāh op.cit. p.68.

3 T.N., p.176, The Hindū calendar all over northern India begins with the reign of Vikramaditya. It is reckoned from the year 57 B.C. Cf. H.G. Rawlinson, A Concise History of the Indian people, p.62.

His last expedition was against Banīyān, possibly to supplant the Khwarazmī nominee, Hasan Qarlugh, but while on the way, he was attacked with fever, and was carried back to Delhi¹ in a litter, where he died on April 30, 1236 A.D.

At his death, Iletmish had not only given political unity to the loosely conquered territories, but also made the Delhi Sultanate stable enough for a dynastic rule. The Caliph of Baghdad, Abū ja'far al-Mansūr, in acknowledgment of his contribution to the Islamic cause, recognized his kingship by honouring him with an investiture in 1229 A.D.²

Iletmish discarded the coinage of Mu'izz al-Dīn, which had contained Nāgarī and Arabic inscriptions along with symbols of the bull of Siva and the Chohan horseman. In its place he introduced a purely Arabic Coinage similar to those used in countries further West, and adopted as his standard coin the silver tanka³, weighing 175 grains.

Rukn ud-Dīn Fīrūz (May 2, 1236 A.D. - November 19, 1236 A.D.)

Iletmish, being satisfied with the ability of his daughter, Radiya, named her as his successor in preference to his son, but

1 T.N. , p. 176.

2 Ibid, p.174.

3 S. Lane^aPoole, Medieval India, p.73

the nobles disregarded the nomination after his death, and placed on the throne his eldest living son, Rukn ud-Dīn Fīrūz, who during his father's lifetime had discharged the duties of governor¹ at Badaun in 1228 A.D., and at Lāhore in 1233 A.D.

According to Minhāj, the young king, before his accession, was famous for generosity and adaptability - qualities which the nobles seem to have taken into account in making him the king. The same authority tells us that after enthronement, Rukn ud-Dīn became a debauch and wasted money on singers and buffoons. Worst of all, he allowed his mother Shāh Turkān to exercise authority in the kingdom, and she had probably proved to be a stern administrator. On acquiring power, she is accused of having mercilessly persecuted the children and the co-wives of Iletmish, and also of having deprived Qutb ud-Dīn, the infant son of Iletmish, of his eye-sight in a barbarous manner, and of² putting him to death.

Minhāj's statement concerning Shāh Turkān appears to be contradictory. He praises the queen-mother's good nature and charitable disposition, particularly to the 'Ulemā, Sayyids, and Zahids, but he also presents her as a devil in human form. Her

1 T.N., pp. 181-182; Cf. 'Isāmī, p.124, who says that Fīrūz became the choice of the nobility in preference to Radiya; Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shāhī, p.21

2 T.N., pp. 182, 183; T.A. Vol. I, p.64. Nizām ud-Dīn says that Shah Turkān, who was jealous of the other ladies of the harem, on obtaining power, had some of them killed with indignity, and those who were spared, lived in utter humiliation; Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shāhī, p.21. Yahya says that the queen mother ruined Iletmish's harem, owing to her old rivalry.

real offence can be traced in the following words of Minhāj. 1

"Dar haḥ wa'agḍ-i mulk tassaraḥ numudan girift wa farmān mī-dād."

(She acquired complete control over state affairs and issued orders).

Those nobles who had thought that while the weak Rukn ud-Dīn would reign like a submissive king real power could be exercised by them, were completely frustrated by the unexpected emergence of Shāh Turkan, with her hold on the administration.

It was, therefore, not unexpected that Rukn ud-Dīn came to be described as an incompetent ruler, and his mother a vicious woman, in order to excite indignation against them throughout the kingdom.

Rukn ud-Dīn's younger brother, Ghiyāth ud-Dīn, the governor of Awadh, doubtless in the hope of occupying the throne, initiated the rebellion by plundering several towns to the east of the jumna, and seizing the revenue proceeding to Delhi from Lakhnautī. The fate of this prince is not known; he is not
2heard of any more.

Several provincial governors also united to oppose Rukn ud-Dīn and his mother. 'Izz ud-Dīn Kabīr of Multān, 'Ala ud-Dīn Jānī of Lāhore, Saif ud-Dīn Kochī of Hānsi and Muḥammad Sālārī

1 T.N., pp. 181-182, 184. Minhāj says that Rukn ud-Dīn, being drunk would ride on an elephant in the street and scatter gold tankas; 'Iṣāmī, p.125.

2 T.N., p. 183.

of Badaūn, moved their forces towards the capital for action.

Nizām ul mulk Junaidī the wazīr, who had perhaps been ignored by Shāh Turkān in the administration, deserted Rukn ud-Dīn and¹ joined the hostile maliks.

The king now awoke to the gravity of the situation, and marched out of Delhī to oppose the advancing forces of the maliks, but his own army revolted on the way in the vicinity of Mansūrpūr and Tarā'in, murdered a number of non-Turkish officers who probably had tried to dissuade them from the rebellion, and² returned to the capital.

Radiya, in the meantime, had cleverly exploited the hostile sentiments of the people against the queen-mother, Shāh Turkān. 'Isāmī says, 'she had reminded the citizens of her father's nomination in her favour, and offered her head as the stake, if³ she did not prove better than men.' Her move produced its desired effect on the citizens of Delhī and the army officers, as

p.183;

1 T.N. Cf. Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p.22. In place of Malik 'Izz ud-Dīn Kabīr Khan, it has Malik 'Izz ud-Dīn Kanjan; Cf Ahmed Muhammad al-Qādī, Nusakh-i Jahān Ara, B.M. Or.141, f 117a, where it is stated that due to the excesses of the queen-mother, all the nobles of the frontier provinces drew their army against Rukn ud-Dīn; Cf Habīb us Siyar, B.M. Add. 27,237, Vol.II, f 478b, Khwand Amir says, "when Shāh Turkān attempted to kill Radiya, the populace of Delhī seized the former and offered their bay'at to Radiya"; Mir Khwand, Randat us Safa, Vol.IV, f 521b.

2 T.N., p.183, Tāj ul Mulk Mahmūd the dabīr and mushrif-i-mamalik, Bahā ul mulk Hasan Asha'ri, Karīm ud-Dīn Zahid, Diya ul mulk son of Nizām ul Mulk Muhammad Junaidī, Nizām ud-Dīn Sharqānī, Khawaja Rashīd ud-Dīn Malkānī, and Amir Fakhr ud-Dīn the dabīr, and a number of other Tājik officials were slain; Cf T.A. Vol.I, p.65; Cf Tārīkh Mubārak Shāhī, p. 23; Nizām ud-Dīn, and Yahya, state that these Tājik officers returned to Delhī, and acknowledged Radiya as their sovereign. For such details, Minhāj is a more reliable authority, as he was present on the occasion.

3 'Isāmī, p. 127.

by the time Rukn ud-Dīn returned to the capital, Shāh Turkān was already a prisoner and Radiya's accession an accomplished fact. Under orders of Radiya, Rukn ud-Dīn was brought from Kilūkhār¹ and imprisoned on November 19, 1236 A.D. where he was put to death.

Radiya (November 19, 1236 - October 13, 1240 A.D.)

In the year 1233 A.D., Iletmish on his return from the Gwālīyur expedition asked Tāj ul mulk Maḥmūd, who was the dabīr and mushrif-i-mamalik, to draft a proclamation announcing the appointment of Radiya as his heir-apparent.²

Her accession on the deposition of Rukn ud-Dīn beset her with enormous difficulties, which hardly abated until the last moment of her life. The energy with which she faced her problems won the applause of Minhāj, 'for her admirable qualities worthy of kings'.³

The continued march of the provincial governors, in spite of the dismissal of the former sovereign against whom it had been initiated, was clearly intended to challenge her sovereignty. To encounter their hostile design, she summoned to her aid Malik

1 T.N., p.184.

2 T.N., p.185, Cf J. Briggs, op.cit., p. 218, Firishta says that Iletmish appointed Radiya as his regent when he left for the siege of Gwālīyur; T.A., Vol.I, p.65.

3 T.N., p. 185; Cf J. Briggs op.cit., p. 217. Firishta informs us that Radiya could read the Qur'an with correct pronunciation.

Nuṣrat ud-Dīn, the governor of Awadh, who on crossing the Ganges was captured by the rebel maliks and died of illness after some time.¹

Left with no support from the provinces, and devoid of an army capable of coping with the governors who had besieged Delhi, she marched out of the capital, and encamping on the bank of the Jumna had recourse to diplomatic devices.² Her able contrivance succeeded in causing misunderstanding among her enemies, and in winning over two of the insurgent governors, 'Izz ud-Dīn Sālārī and Kabīr Khān, to her side. News of secret alliance and understanding was cleverly circulated to the opposite camp, which worked according to plan in upsetting and disheartening the other rebel governors and the wazīr.³

As a result, the rest of the rebel maliks fled to save their lives but were pursued. Saif ud-Dīn Kochī and his brother Fakhr ud-Dīn were captured and put to death after a short imprisonment. 'Alā ud-Dīn Jānī's head was brought to Delhi from Pāel, while Nizām ul mulk Junaidī the wazīr died a fugitive in the Sirmūr hills.⁴

¹ T.A., vol.I, p.66, where we read 'Izz ud-Dīn Hānsī in place of Nuṣrat ud-Dīn; T.N., pp.186, 242; Minhāj says, Nuṣrat ud-Dīn was seized by the rebels, brought under control, and he died of illness after some time; Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p.25. Yahya being misled by the term 'istaqbal' used by Minhāj, has changed the entire text as follows; 'he was welcomed by the rebel governors, won over and was dissuaded to assist Raḍīya.

² T.N., p.186, Minhāj says that a minor skirmish took place between the rival forces and then peace was restored; Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p.25, Yahya says that after battle engagement peace was at last restored at the intervention of the Imāms and Shaikhs of the city.

³ T.N., pp.186-187; Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p.25, Yahya says that one might Kanjan and Sālārī assembled in front of the royal pavilion to seize Malik Jānī, Malik Kochī and Nizām ul Mulk.

⁴ T.N., p.187.

Having successfully encountered her initial difficulties, like a wise ruler she now set herself to the task of reorganising the government in order to increase the strength of her supporters. Khawāja Muha dhdhab ud-Dīn was appointed the wazīr with the usual title of Nizām ul mulk; Kabīr Khān was rewarded with the governorship of Lāhore for helping during her crisis; Saif ud-Dīn Aybek was appointed deputy-chief of the army with the title of Qutlugh Khān, and he was succeeded on his death by Qutb ud-Dīn Hussain.¹

That the solution of the problems of the kingdom was now well within her grasp is shown by the arrival of a message of loyalty and valuable presents from 'Izz ud-Dīn Tughril, the governor of Lakhnautī. Rāḍiyya returned the compliments by raising him to the dignity of Viceroy, but this did not deter him from later becoming a cause of concern to Delhi.²

According to Minhaj, the maliks and amīrs from Debāl to Lakhnautī tendered their allegiance to the Delhi sovereign.³ The appearance of the Qarlugh prince, Nāṣir ud-Dīn Muḥammad, before Rāḍiyya when she was in the Punjāb, in 1240 A.D. probably to request military assistance against the mongols, provides another proof of her effective sovereignty. The prince returned disappointed, without leave, as the best Rāḍiyya

¹ T.N., p.187; T.A. Vol.I, pp.66-7.

² T.N., pp.243-245, Rāḍiyya conferred on him a canopy of state and a red standard.

³ T.N., p.187.

offered to do, was to assign him the territory of Baran for his shelter and expenses.¹

Such success must have considerably strengthened her self-confidence, as soon after, to attach more weight to her authority, which she presumed was handicapped by her effeminate appearance, she decided to behave every bit like a male. She gave up the female attire, left the veil, and appeared both in the court and in the camp dressed as a man. Her lifting the veil, and appearing in public seem to have alienated public opinion.² The proximity to Radiya of Jamāl ud-Dīn Yaqūt, the amīr-i ākhur, served as a pretext for casting aspersions on her character, and for arousing the indignation of the Turks. A conspiracy to depose her was hatched under the leadership of Ikhtiyār ud-Dīn Aytigin, the amīr-i halib.³

The first to rise in revolt was Kabīr Khān, the governor of Lāhore, in 1240 A.D. Radiya promptly marched against him into the Punjāb and compelled the rebel to surrender unconditionally, thus foiling the first

¹ T.N., p.392; Raverty, op.cit., p.645, n.7; T.A.Vol.I, p.66. Nizām ud-Dīn says that Radiya, after her accession, again enforced the rules and principles of the reign of her father which had fallen into disuse in the days of Rukn ud-Dīn.

² T.N., p.188; Cf. 'Isāmī, p.128, who says that three years after accession, Radiya gave up purdah, became shameless and immodest, and donned the male garment. When she came out of the palace and mounted the elephant, everyone enjoyed her beauty.

³ T.N., pp.187-8; Cf. Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p.26, Yahya says 'As Jamāl ud-Dīn Yaqūt, the Abyssinian, was made the amīr-i-ākhur and became her close companion, and the envy of the amirs and maliks, was excited.' Cf. 'Isāmī, p.129, who says, 'As the Abyssinian used to raise Radiya on the elephant by her arms, the nobles became offended; Cf. T.A., Vol.I, p.67, Nizām ud-Dīn says that the amīr-i-ākhur placed his hand under Radiya's arms and put her on the animal she rode; Cf. Badāyūnī, Vol.I, p.84, who says that whenever Radiya rode horse or elephant, she would rest upon the shoulder of Jamāl ud-Dīn.

plot against her. Kabīr Khān was transferred as the mugta' of Multān, and Malik Qarāqash was placed in the charge of Lāhore. Soon after, Altūniya, the governor of Bhatinda, rebelled, but this time the conspirators had moved with more measured steps, as is suggested by subsequent developments. Before Rāḍiya was drawn into Bhatinda, a close co-operation was established between the court and the provinces; the army had been won over and a successor had been already chosen.¹

With uncompromising determination, Rāḍiya marched out to crush Altūniya's uprising in April 1240 A.D., defying the heat of summer and the inconvenience of Ramḍān; on her arrival at Bhatinda, she discovered the plot against her, when Jamāl ud-Dīn Yāqūt, one of her chief supporters, was murdered by her own retinue, and she was seized and imprisoned in the fort of Bhatinda.²

When the news of her capture reached Delhī, Mu'izz ud-Dīn Bahram, the son of Iltutmish, who had been selected earlier to replace her, was raised to the throne.³

¹ T.N., p.188; Cf. T.A., Vol.I, p.67; Nizām ud-Dīn is wrong in saying that in 1240 A.D. Rāḍiya assigned Multān to Kabīr Khān, in addition to Lāhore.

² T.N., pp.188-189; Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī, p.27, Yahya says that when the army of Rāḍiya appeared before Bhatinda on April 10, 1240 A.D., some of the amirs, maliks and shamsi slaves, having seceded and joined Altūniya, put Jamāl ud-Dīn Yāqūt to death; Cf. 'Isāmī, p. 130, who says that Yāqūt was murdered in the palace when Rāḍiya was giving audience. Afterwards she was herself imprisoned and sent to Bhatinda. This statement is incorrect as it differs from that of Minhāj, who was an eye-witness.

³ T.N., p.191; Cf. Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, Yahya says that after imprisoning Rāḍiya the seceders sent a letter to the amirs at Delhī to enthrone Bahram.

The conspirators having executed the whole scheme according to plan, returned to Delhi to work out the details of the new arrangement. They were cautious to avoid the mistake they had committed in the case of Radiya.

Radiya, now in prison, made a final effort to retrieve her position. She married her captor, Altuniya, probably in the hope of receiving the support of his old confederates; this came to be partially true, as when they jointly marched to Delhi to wrest back the crown, they were joined by Malik Qaraqash and Malik Salari, but this effort was doomed to failure. According to 'Isami, Bahrām entrusted young Balban to head the troops. He competently carried out the assignment and completely routed the mercenary army of Radiya. Minhāj says that Mu'izz ud-Dīn Bahrām himself led the army, when Badr ud-Dīn Sunqur performed creditably on the battlefield against Radiya.¹

Radiya and Altuniya were unsuccessfully pursued by the royal troops, and though they did not fall into their hands, they were murdered by Hindū robbers, on October 13, 1240, A.D., while taking shelter under a tree at Kaithal.²

¹T.N. pp.190,255; Cf. 'Isami, pp.133-136, who furnishes a story which is not quoted by any other authority. He says that Radiya remained imprisoned at Bhatinda for one year and six months. Latuni, an adventurer Turk, seized Bhatinda, freed Radiya from the prison and married her. They assembled a large army consisting of Khokars and others, and marched to Delhi; Cf. J. Briggs, *op.cit.*, p.221.

²T.N., p.190; Cf. 'Isami, pp.134-136; Cf. T.A., Vol.I, pp.67,68. Nizām ud-Dīn, 'Isami, and some others say that Radiya twice marched with an army against Bahrām, but Minhāj mentions only one expedition; Cf. *Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi*, p.29, where it is said that Altuniya and Radiya when fleeing were seized by the Hindūs and sent to Bahrām in chains where they were put to death.

The reign of Radiya except for some minor events, hardly had any political bearing on the Delhi Sultanate; nevertheless, these indicated the religious and political climate of the country, and her capacity to deal with them.

Fresh from her success over the provincial governors, she provided proof of the vigour of her reign by sending an expedition under Malik Qutb ud-Din Hussain to relieve the garrison at Ranthambur; which had been under Hindū seige, since the death of Iltmish. The royal force could do nothing more than relieve the besieged men and destroy the fortress.¹

In March 1237 A.D. about one thousand heretics under instigation of Nur Turk attacked the congregation assembled for the Friday prayer in the Jāmi' masjid of Delhi. Many of the congregation lost their lives, some by the sword and others in the stampede. The situation was relieved when Turkish warriors, aided by the worshippers who had ascended the roof of the mosque and were throwing down stones and bricks, entered the mosque and killed the heretics to the last man.²

Tāj ud-Din Saḡar Qıqluq's sudden arrival from his iqtā' of Baran to Gwālīyūr under the orders of Radiya, the cause of which Minhāj seems unwilling to give in clear language, taken together with what happened

¹ T.N., p.187, Minhāj says that the siege was in effect for a long time; Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī, p.26, Yahya tells us that the siege continued since the death of Iltmish.

² T.N., p.189; Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī, p.24. Yahya says that two thousand Qaramitahs attacked the congregation.

in future, suggests that the new ruler was determined to suppress any sign of disaffection towards her. In March 1238 A.D., Tāj ud-Dīn compelled Diyāud-Dīn Junaidī, the amīr-i dād of Gwālīyūr, and the latter's supporters, which included Minhāj, to return to Delhi. The subsequent assignment of the qāḍiship of Gwālīyūr and the charge of the Nāṣiriya college in Delhi to Minhāj, shows Rāḍiyya's satisfaction with the former's explanation. The Amīr-i dād Junaidī, who was perhaps a relation of the late wazīr, Kamāl ud-Dīn Muḥammad Junaidī, is not heard of again.

Mu'izz ud-Dīn Bahram (April 22, 1240 A.D. - May 10, 1242, A.D.)

Bahram's kingship involved the condition of delegating all authority to a deputy of the kingdom, known as nā'ib-i mulk, for a period of one year. The newly created office was given to Ikhtiyār-ud-Dīn Aytigīn as a reward of his successful conspiracy, and in the hope that domination of the Turkish oligarchy would remain assured in his hands.¹

Minhāj gives us to understand that since Aytigīn married the king's sister and assumed all powers with the royal insignia of triple naubat and elephant, he fell into Bahram's disfavour.² The pretext is unconvincing as Muḥadhḥab ud-Dīn who was simultaneously

¹ T.N., pp.191-192; Cf. Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī, p.28. Yahya says that the amirs and maliks who had accompanied Rāḍiyya, on their return, paid homage to Mu'izz ud-Dīn on the condition that Aytigīn would be appointed as the nā'ib-i mulk.

² T.N., p.192; Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī, p.28; J. Briggs, op.cit., pp.223-4; T.A., Vol.1, p.68.

stabbed with the nā'ib-i mulk could not be accused of any such excesses.

In fact, the young king had become impatient of the control exercised by the nā'ib-i mulk and the wazīr, and in order to terminate the existing arrangement, he lured both of them to attend a religious discourse. After the sermon was delivered, two Turks, under direction of the king appeared from the upper part of the palace and stabbed the unsuspecting Aytigīn and the wazīr in the 'Audience Hall' of the Qasr-i-Safed (White Castle). The former succumbed to his injuries on the spot, while the latter after receiving two wounds, managed to escape with his life.¹

Bahrām's aggressive role, though in open contravention of the original agreement, was the only recourse of which he could avail himself in order to end the tutelage and to exercise unquestioned authority. But he was soon to be disillusioned. The new amīr-i hājib, Badrud-Dīn Sinqur, though not invested with the title and powers of his predecessor, appeared to be more undesirable in his attitude than the former nā'ib-i-mulk. He attempted to behave like a de facto ruler by usurping the powers of the wazīr, and issuing his own orders in complete disregard of the Sultān's authority.²

¹T.N., p.192; Cf. J.Briggs, *op.cit.*, p.224. Firishta describes the incident differently. He says that when the king was giving public audience, two Turks began to create trouble, and as Ikhtiyār ud-Dīn Alptigīn (the Aytigīn of other works) tried to turn them out they stabbed him first and then went after the wazīr, on whom they inflicted two wounds.

²T.N., pp.193,255.

Sunqur, conscious of the fact that his conduct would not be condoned by the king, and also to avoid Aytigīn's fate, entered into conspiracy with the religious men, the amīrs, and other important personages, for the dethronement of Bahrām.¹ Wedded to the belief that Muhadhhab ud-Dīn had not forgotten the treachourous attack on his person at the Qasr-i-Safed, he committed the blunder of including him in the conspiracy.

For the wazīr this was the opportunity of avenging the insult of being ignored in state matters. When Sunqur's emissary, the Sadr ul mulk Sayyid Taj ud-Dīn 'Alī Musawī, arrived at the wazīr's residence and disclosed the plot in which his participation had been solicited, the wazīr had a confidential servant of the Sultān concealed in a place from where he could overhear the conversation. When the emissary departed, Wazīr Muhadhhab-ud-Dīn at once despatched the concealed person to the king to report all that he had heard.²

Bahrām personally went to the scene of the conspiracy where he detected Sunqur red-handed. After dispersing the gathering, he

¹ T.N., pp.193-5. The religious men were offended with Bahrām, as Shams ud-Dīn, the qādī of Mehr, was thrown under the feet of an elephant on the instigation of a recluse, named Ayub.

² T.N., pp.193+4; Cf. T.A., Vol.I, p.69, Nizām ud-Dīn is wrong in saying that Sadr ul mulk, who had been sent to summon Nizām ul mulk kept a person concealed in a corner, and afterwards through the concealed person, represented the facts to the Sultān. According to Minhāj, Sadr ul mulk Taj ud-Dīn Musawī was later executed.

ordered Sunqur to proceed forthwith to his iqṭā' of Badaūn, and Qādī Jalāl ud-Dīn Kāshānī, one of the chief conspirators, was removed from the post of qādī. Qādī Kabīr ud-Dīn and Shāikh Muḥammad Shāmī, who were also involved, out of fear fled from the city.¹

Bahrām's conduct had hitherto alienated the malīks and religious men, but the person who at heart was his bitterest enemy was the wazīr, Muḥadhdhab ud-Dīn. Although the wazīr's dream of exercising all power had been realised after Sunqur's death, he still nursed his grudge against the ruler for being stabbed. His opportunity to retaliate came when the Mongols besieged Lāhore in 1241 A.D. and he and Malik Qutb ud-Dīn Hussain were sent with troops from the capital to relieve the city. When the army reached the Sutlej, the wazīr sent a letter to the king asking his permission to destroy the Turkish nobles, as they had become ill-disposed to him. The ruler, without realising the gravity of such an edict, sent the desired order to the wazīr. The latter made no delay in showing the death-warrant from the Sultān to the Turks and amīrs, who in a fury turned back to the capital to effect Bahrām's dethronement.²

¹T.N., p.194.

²T.N., p.196. Minhāj says that the Sultān, out of childishness and haste consented to the destruction of the Turkish nobles, as requested by Nizām ul mulk; Cf. Badāyūnī, Vol.I, p.36, who says, Bahrām wrote that the disaffected amīrs would be punished in due time, until then they should be treated with civility; Cf. T.A., Vol.I, p.70. Nizām ud-Dīn says that the king, out of his simplicity and the confidence he had in Muḥadhdhab ud-Dīn, replied that these people deserved to be executed, and at the right time they would get their punishment, but for a few days it would be better to temporize with them. Tārīkh-i Mubarak Shāhi, p.30.

On being informed of the army's attitude, the king sent the Shaikh ul Islām, Sayyid Qutb ud-Dīn, to pacify them, but the Shaikh instead used his influence to stir the marchers to more hostile action.¹

The army returned to the capital on February 22, 1242 A.D. and continued hostility for a period of about three months, in which many people were killed and disabled. At last the city fell to the besiegers on May 10, 1242 A.D., when the king was taken prisoner, and executed after three days.²

'Alā ud-Dīn Mas'ūd (May 10, 1242 A.D. - June 10, 1246 A.D.)

After the capture of Bahram, 'Izz ud-Dīn Balban Kashlū Khān, one of the ring-leaders in the uprising against the last ruler, made his bid for the throne, but his claim was repudiated by his own partisans, who assembled at the tomb of Iltīmish and decided to elect 'Alā ud-Dīn Mas'ūd, the son of Rukn ud-Dīn Firūz, as their king.³

On the accession of Mas'ūd, Qutb ud-Dīn Hussain was appointed nā'ib-i mulk, Malik Qarāqash was given the office of amīr-i hajib, while

¹ T.N., p.196; T.A., Vol.I, p.70, Nizām ud-Dīn wrongly says that the Shaikh ul Islām, who had been sent by Bahram to pacify the army, returned to Delhi on being unsuccessful in his mission; Cf. Tarikh-i Mubarak Shahi, p.32.

² T.N., p.197, Minhāj attributes the prolonged siege to the influence of Mubarak Shah Farrash, who dissuaded Bahram from accepting the terms of accommodation.

³ T.N., pp.197-198; T.A., Vol.I, pp.70,71; Cf. Tarikh-i Mubarak Shahi, p.33; J.Briggs, op.cit., p.229; Cf. Badayuni, Vol.I, p.87, who says that 'Izz ud-Dīn Balban remained in possession of the throne for 'one day' and issued a proclamation intimating his assumption of sovereignty.

Balban Kashlū Khān was assigned the extensive territory of Mandawar, Nāgor and Ajmīr, as an appreciation of his withdrawal from the throne. On the resignation of Minhāj from the post of the Chief-Qādi, it seems the faction in power was opposed to him - 'Imād ud-Dīn Muḥammad Shafurqānī was appointed in his place.¹

Muḥadhdhab ud-Dīn, the chief architect of the last rebellion was allowed to retain the office of wazīr. He concentrated all authority in his hands, and having forgotten the fate of Ikhtiyār ud-Dīn Aytigīn, unauthorisedly assumed regal pretensions by establishing the naubat and stationing an elephant at the door of his residence. To complete his grip on the government, he began to exclude the Turkish aristocracy from the offices of the state. This policy proved costly to him. The Turkish amīrs, who could hardly allow their racial interest to suffer, assassinated him on October 28, 1242 A.D. The office of wazīr was then assigned to Najm ud-Dīn Abū Bakr.²

Subsequent activities in the province and centre furnish proof of the vigour of Mas'ūds' reign. In 1242 A.D., Malik Tāj ud-Dīn Sanjar Qiqluq, the governor of Badaūn, successfully suppressed the troublesome Rājputs of Katehr and Badaūn, and while he was planning to extend his conquest, he died of poison.³

Malik Tāj ud-Dīn Sanjar Kuret Khān, the governor of Awadh, after reducing the local tribes to obedience, marched to the subjugation

¹ T.N., p.198.

² T.N., pp.198-199; Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī, p.33.

³ T.N., p.257.

of Behār which the Hindūs had recovered during the stalemate in the Delhi Sultanate. Although he lost his life during the invasion, nevertheless, he succeeded in subjecting the city to plunder.¹

The Mongol pressure on Upper Sind had obliged Hasan Qarlugh to seek a secure shelter to the east of the Indus. He therefore attacked Multān but was repulsed by Tāj ud-Dīn Abū Bakr, whose father Kabīr Khān had renounced his allegiance to Delhi, during the Mongol invasion in early 1242 A.D. In the year 1242 A.D., Hasan Qarlugh again attacked Multān and captured it, which remained with him till 1246⁻⁴⁶ A.D.²

Malik 'Izz ud-Dīn Tughril Tughān Khān, the governor of Lakhnauti, whose *de facto* rulership of the eastern territory of the Delhi Sultanate had been confirmed by the royal court, sought to extend his authority under the instigation of his confidential adviser Bahā ud-Dīn Hila'ī, by attempting to annex Awadh and Kara-Manikpūr to his government. Minhāj who was then waiting on Tughril at Awadh, leaves the impression that the latter abandoned his ambitious project and returned to Delhi, on his persuasion.³

¹T.N., p.259.

²T.N., p.235; Cf. Muḥammad Ḥamīd Quraishī, 'Multan its brief history and Persian and Arabic inscriptions', *Epigraphia Indo Moslemica*, 1927-28, p.4, Quraishī says that Saifud-Dīn Hasan Qarlugh conquered Multān in 639 A.H./1242 A.D. and ruled over it as an independent sovereign, coining money in his own name; Cf. E.Thomas, *op.cit.*, pp.94-96. Thomas is wrong in saying that Hasan Qarlugh died in 1239-40 A.D., as according to Minhāj he was killed in 1246-47 A.D. (T.N., p.270).

³T.N., pp.243-4; Cf. Yazdānī, 'The Barī Dargāh Inscription Behār', *Epigraphia Indo Moslemica*, 1913-14, pp.16-7. Yazdānī calls Izzud-Dīn Tughril the *de facto* ruler of the territory extending from Lakhnauti to Kara-Manikpur, and Tirhut to Jājnagar.

Towards the end of 1243 A.D., the Rāe of Jājnagar pillaged the southern parts of Lakhnoutī. 'Izz ud-Dīn Tughril, the governor of the eastern provinces, marched against him and plundered Katsin in reprisal. In retaliation, the Jājnagar army surprised Tughril in his camp when his soldiers had retired for food. Tughril, having lost a number of his men, retired to Lakhnoutī, from where he despatched Sharf ul mulk Asha'rī to Delhi soliciting armed assistance. The Jājnagar army encouraged by its previous success, in the following year marched towards Lakhnoutī, under the leadership of Samanta Rāe. Fakhr ul mulk Karīm ud-Dīn Lāghirī, the governor of Lakhnōr intercepted the invaders but was slain with a number of his soldiers. To check the advance of the invading army Tughril himself came out of the city but was again compelled to retreat. The Jājnagar force retired on hearing about the arrival of reinforcement from Awadh.¹

Tamur Khān, the governor of Awadh, arrived at Lakhnoutī in April 1245 A.D. and perhaps on the basis of a royal order, demanded the surrender of the city to him. Tughril's reluctance led to an appeal to arms, but a compromise was ultimately effected through the good offices of Minhāj. Tughril made over the city to Tamur and retired to Delhi, with his treasures, elephants, and troops, where after some time he was assigned the province of Awadh.²

¹T.N., pp.243-5; Cf. T.A., p.72. Nizām ud-Dīn has confused the infidels of Jājnagar with the infidels of Chengīz Khān and this error has been copied by Firishṭa and others; Cf. J.Briggs, *op.cit.*, p.231. Briggs questions Firishṭa's statement that a Mongol army had invaded Lakhnoutī, and calls it 'extremely curious.'

²T.N., pp.244-6; T.A., p.72.

The Mongols who were hammering on the western frontier of Delhi, appeared before Multān in 1246 A.D. and drove out Hasan Qarlugh. They also besieged Uchch, where they had been led by Jaspāl Sehrā, a chief of the Salt Range. The inhabitants resisted for some time, but ultimately asked relief from Delhi. 'Alā ud-Dīn Mas'ūd, responding promptly, marched with a strong force to the Beās, upon which the Mongols withdrew beyond the Indus, leaving a number of captives behind.¹

The statement of Minhāj, accepted without question by subsequent chroniclers, that the energetic Mas'ūd, who had so long been a conscientious ruler, and had most recently been successful against the Mongols, 'suddenly became a villain and a murderer', hardly seems to contain any particle of truth. Like his predecessors, Mas'ūd also became a victim of conspiracy and was consequently imprisoned on June 10, 1246 A.D. and put to death some time later.²

Nāsir ud-Dīn Mahmūd (June 10, 1246 A.D. - February 18, 1266 A.D.)

Alā ud-Dīn Mas'ūd, during the later part of his reign, had released from confinement his two uncles, Nāsir ud-Dīn Mahmūd and Jalāl ud-Dīn,

¹ T.N., p.200.

² T.N., p.201, Cf. 'Isāmī, pp.138-9, who says that Mas'ūd became proud of his success against the Mongols, and began to behave like a tyrant, which led to his being despised by everyone; Cf. T.A.Vol.I, p.72. Nizām ud-Dīn says that after success over Mongols, Mas'ūd turned away from the path of righteousness and justice and resorted to the practice of malevolence; Cf. Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhi, p.34. Yahya says that Mas'ūd was seized and imprisoned and he drew his last breath in prison; Habib us Siyar, B.M., Add 27,237, Vol.II, f.480a; Cf. Tārīkh-i Haggī, B.M., Or.26,210, f.11b, 'Abdul Haq adds to the information of Minhāj, without quoting his authority, by saying that Mas'ūd besides killing the maliks, gave himself up to wine, hunting and excessive debauchery.

the sons of Iletmish, and had assigned the governorship of Bahraich to the former, and that of Qanauj to the latter.¹

The deposition of Mas'ūd brought to the throne Nāṣir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd, a youth of seventeen. From the very beginning of his reign he furnished proof of being an energetic ruler. The Hindū chiefs occupying the hilly tract west of the Upper Sand-Sāgar Doab, were the first to engage his attention with their menacing activities against the Delhī Sultānate. In 1246 A.D. he set out from Delhī, and having himself halted on the bank of the Chenāb directed Balban to advance to the Salt Range to punish Jaspāl Sehra, who, according to Minhāj, had guided the Mongols to Uchch during the reign of Mas'ūd.² Though no substantial gain could be achieved, satisfaction was derived by a widespread plunder of the territory as far as the neighbourhood of Nandānah. The Mongols, who were reconnoitring on the opposite bank of the Jheum, retired when they found the Delhī army on the opposite side.

In 1247 A.D., in order to acquire wealth, an expedition was sent against the Hindū chiefs established south of the Jumna. 'Dalakī wa Malakī' a powerful Rāna with strongholds between Kālinjar and Kara was pursued by Balban from one fortress to another, and although the Rāna succeeded in withdrawing after a stiff resistance, his wives and children

¹ T.N., p.199; Cf. T.A., Vol.I, p.71.

² T.N., p.209; Cf. Nusakh-i Jahān Ārā, B.M., Or. 141, f.118a, where it is stated that Maḥmūd was born in 626 A.H./1229 A.D.

and a rich booty fell into the hands of the Muslim army.¹

In 1249 A.D. Balban moved to the south of Delhi to punish the Mewāttis for their persistent hostility to the Delhi Sultanate. During this period, he also made an ineffective attempt to recapture Ranthambor, which had been recovered by the Rājputs in the reign of Rādīya.²

As Kahlū Khān had occupied Uchch without relinquishing his *iqṭā'* of Nāgor, which had been the stipulation of Nāsir ud-Dīn Mahmūd, in 1250 A.D., the royal army marched against him to enforce obedience. Kahlū submitted and moved to Uchch, whereupon Nāgor was assigned to Saif ud-Dīn Aybek Kahlī Khān, the younger brother of Ghīyath ud-Dīn Balban.³

In 1251 A.D., Balban led an army to the southern frontier of Delhi and attacked the powerful Rāna, Chahār Ajārī, whose fortress situated among the defiles and passes was plundered, and immense booty and prisoners were captured.⁴

As Balban now exercised unrestricted authority in the kingdom, a group of nobles, consisting of Indian Muslims and some Turks, became resentful of his domination.⁵ According to Minhāj, the leader of the

¹ T.N., p.291, Cf. B.De., Translation of *Tabaqāt-i Akbarī*, pp.86-7, n.7. De says that Rāna Dalakī wa Malakī had numerous followers and immense wealth and his territory had never before been reached by the *Mussalmāns* on account of its extremely difficult road; Cf. *Tārīkh-i Mubarak Shāhī*, p.35, Yahya wrongly says that Dalakī wa Malakī was taken prisoner in this expedition.

² T.N., pp.212-3; 293; Cf. T.A., Vol.I, p.74. Nizām ud-Dīn says that Balban proceeded against Ranthambor and returned after chastising the Rājputs.

³ T.N., pp.269,280.

⁴ T.N., p.215; T.A., Vol.I, p.74; Cf. *Tārīkh-i Mubarak Shāhī*, p.36. Yahya says that Chahār Ajārī, the mightiest infidel of the area, encountered the Muslim army with five thousand horse and two hundred thousand infantry.

⁵ T.A.Vol.I, p.74. Nizām ud-Dīn says that 'Balban established his authority as *nā'ib-i mulk* in such a way that everything connected with administration came under his direct control, and no one else had any hand in the affairs of the kingdom.

of the dissident group, 'Imād ud-Dīn Rayhān, 'poisoned the mind' of the Sultān so successfully that he quickly responded to the demand for Balban's removal from the key position in the kingdom.

During the expedition to Multān and Uchch, which was directed against Shīr Khān Sunqur for his unauthorized aggression on the north-west, Balban was dismissed on the way from the office of na'ib-i milk, and asked to proceed to his iqta' of Hānsī.¹

Balban's dismissal was followed by the removal of his prominent supporters from the court. Within five months the palace administration was reshuffled, and some of the important offices were assigned to Rayhān's men. Saif ud-Dīn Aybak, the brother of Balban, was removed from the post of amīr-i hājib, and sent to his iqta' of Kara. 'Imād ud-Dīn Rayhān became the wakil-i dar, and Muḥammad Junaidī was made the wazīr. Shahzāda Rukn ud-Dīn was appointed as the amīr-i hājib, and was given the iqta' of Hānsī on the transfer of Balban to Nāgor. Shams-ud-Dīn of Bahraich replaced Minhāj as the chief qādī and Arsalan Khān was assigned the iqta' of Multān, Uchch and Bhatinda, which had been held by the deputies of Shīr Khān Sunqur.²

In 1254 A.D., Mahmūd resumed his military operations against the Hindu chiefs. According to Minhāj, success was attained at Bijnaur

¹ T.N., p.217, Cf. P.Saran, 'Sultān Nāsīrud-Dīn Mahmūd the slave and his two ministers,' Journal of the U.P. Historical Society, Vol.XV, part II, p.74, says "Indeed it was Balban's supercilious behaviour with the Sultan which was responsible for his fall and disgrace."

² T.N., p.280, 217-8; Cf. T.A., Vol.I, p.75, Nizām ud-Dīn is wrong in saying that Malik 'Izz ud-Dīn Kashlu Khān became the amīr-i hājib, on the dismissal of Balban.

and Bardār, but at Tanklabālī, where the contest was probably more serious, a Muslim officer, Malik 'Izzud-Dīn Durmaṣhī, lost his life.¹

That the Turks would soon resist the domination of the Indian wakīl-i dar, was not unexpected. Minhāj tells us that the Turks and Tajiks, in 1254 A.D., became disgusted at the insolence and domination of the upstart eunuch, Rayhān, and organised themselves into a confederacy to effect his removal. As a result, Balban from Nāgaur, Bat-Khān Aybek from Sanām, and Arsalān Khān from Bhatinda joined Jalāl ud-Dīn, the brother of the king, at Bhatinda, with the intention of moving towards the capital.²

Nāṣir ud-Dīn Mahmūd, showed no sign of yielding and moved out of Delhī to oppose the hostile maliks.

The rival forces confronted each other at a place between Kaithal and Hānsī. Minhāj who is seldom kind to Rayhān, says that the latter prompted by personal interest, tried his best for an armed clash, but the intervention of sensible men from both sides prevented the conflict and brought about a settlement. The same authority says that as Rayhān was aware of the fact that the confederates of Jalāl ud-Dīn would not accept anything less than his dismissal, he tried to foil the negotiation by plotting the assassination of the emissary of the opposite camp,

¹ T.N., p.218.

² Ibid., p.219, Cf. P.Saran, op.cit., p.71, who rightly says, "The policies and actions of the Turkish nobility who were in power, were determined and moulded by a deep vanity, born of a feeling of superiority, natural to all conquerors over the conquered."

expecting that it would be retaliated by the murder of the Sultān's envoy. The plot was detected and Rayhān was ordered to proceed to his iqṭā' of Badaūn, from where after some time, he was transferred to Bahraich.¹ Jalāl ud-Dīn was appointed to the government of Lāhore, and Balban once again became the nā'ib-i mulk.

Balban's adversaries, who had thrived at his dismissal, now came under the axe of his retribution. In 1255 A.D. Qutlugh Khān, a strong supporter of Rayhān, was asked to go to the iqṭā' of Awadh, the reason given was his marriage with the queen-mother.² According to Minhāj, Qutb ud-Dīn Hussain, who had perhaps discharged the duties of nā'ib-i mulk, was imprisoned and executed by the order of the king in 1255 A.D., because he had made some insolent remarks, 'Isāmī tells us that the latter was murdered in the court at the instigation of Balban, and when Mahmūd came out hearing the dying shrieks, he was told 'a thorn had been removed from the garden of the kingdom'.³

A dangerous rival like Rayhān could hardly be allowed to live in peace; his destruction was inevitable. The tactics of playing one noble against another was employed. Although Rayhān was in physical possession of his iqṭā' of Bahraich, it was assigned to Tāj ud-Dīn Sanjar Sihwistānī with instructions for its occupation at the cost of the former's expulsion.

¹ T.N., pp.301-3.

² T.N., p.220; Cf. T.A., Vol.I, p.76. Nizām ud-Dīn says that Mahmūd, being annoyed with his mother for her marriage with Quthugh Khān, asked her to leave the capital and go to Awadh.

³ T.N., p.220, 'Isāmī, p.154.

Qutlugh Khān, who held Awadh, came to the support of Rayhān, and succeeded in seizing and imprisoning Sanjar, who managed to escape; returning later with a small force, he encountered Rayhān and killed him in 1255 A.D.¹

Qutlugh's assistance to Rayhān was not overlooked, as soon after he was asked to relinquish Awadh and go to Bahraich; when he did not comply, a force was despatched under Malik Bak-Tamur for his expulsion. As Bak-Tamur was defeated and killed, Balban himself took the field against him, when, according to Minhāj, Qutlugh evaded a battle-engagement and retired. Balban then marched to Kālinjar where he plundered the Hindū tribes and returned to Delhī. As in the meantime Qutlugh had made an unsuccessful attempt to seize Kara-Mānikpūr, in 1257 A.D., the royal army was once again sent in pursuit of him, and it went as far as Sirmur hills where he had taken shelter. As Qutlugh, and also the Rāna who had provided him asylum, fled on the approach of the Delhī army, Balban satisfied his vengeance by thoroughly plundering the territory.²

In 1256-57 A.D., Kashlū Khān the governor of Uchch and Multān, renounced his loyalty to Delhī and acknowledged Mongol-overlordship. In 1257 A.D., on the secret invitation of the discontented people of Delhī, which included religious men, he also made an attempt in co-

¹ T.N., pp.220-304.

² Ibid., p.221; Cf. *Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī*, p.37. Yahya is wrong in stating that an encounter took place in which Qutlugh and his followers were defeated.

operation with Qutluḡh Khān to surprise the capital and capture the throne, but on his arrival in the vicinity of Delhi he found the city prepared for resistance and his supporters banished.¹

In 1257-58 A.D., Delhi came under the threat of a Mongol invasion for which a vigilant body of troops had to be posted throughout the kingdom.² It was only in 1260 A.D. that the Delhi Sultanate could feel free of the threat of foreign aggression when emissaries from Khurāsān conveyed Hulāgū's message to Nāṣir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd, that there would be no further Mongol raids on Hindūstān.³

In 1260 A.D., when Hulāgū's messengers were in the neighbourhood of Delhi, Balban decided to take punitive measures against the Mewāṭṭīs for their plundering activities in 1257-58 A.D. By a single forced march he surprised the Mewāṭṭīs and punished them with utmost rigour. After continuous slaughter and destruction for twenty days, he returned to the capital with immense booty and prisoners.⁴ The captured

¹ T.N., p.224.

² *Ibid.*, pp.225,273; Cf. *Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī*, p.38. Yahya says that at the end of 1257 A.D., a Mongol army arrived in the neighbourhood of Uchch and Multān when Kashlū Khān made a common cause with them. Mahmud collected an army to march against them, the Mongols on receiving this news retired towards Khurāsān.

³ T.N., p.322; *Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī*, p.38, Yahya is wrong in stating that Mongol envoys visited Delhi in 1258, A.D.

⁴ T.N., p.315, Minhāj says that Balban rewarded his soldiers, one silver tanka for bringing a head, and two for a live captive.

rebels with their two hundred and fifty leaders including Malka, were given condign punishment.

When those Mewattis who had managed to escape, after returning, reverted to their old practices, Balban again attacked them by surprise and according to Minhāj, brought twelve thousand of them under the sword.¹

The contemporary chronicler closes his account in 1260 A.D., and the gap till 1266 A.D. is inadequately touched upon by the later historians, some of whom say that Maḥmūd fell sick in 1265 A.D. and died on February 18, 1266 A.D.² However, they have no reliable information on this period.

¹T.N., p.323.

²T.A. Vol.I, p.77. Nizām ud-Dīn says that Maḥmūd wrote two copies of the Qur'ān every year, and spent the sale money on his food. As he had no attendant his wife used to cook food and one day she complained that her hand ached when she had to bake the bread. On requesting a slave-girl to assist her in work, Maḥmūd replied that the treasury was not his private property, and that she should remain patient to be rewarded on the day of judgment. Minhāj, however, does not mention any such thing regarding his patron; neither ^{is} there any evidence in the activities of the Sultān to support such a statement.

CHAPTER IV

The Classes and Offices of the Nobility

During the thirteenth century the most important class in the official hierarchy of the Delhi Sultanate was the nobility. Having replaced the Hindū ruling class, they became the caretaker of the Sultanate's administration. Theoretically the nobles stood next to the Sultān but, in practise, they enjoyed a pivotal position around whom the whole administrative machinery revolved, and until the accession of Balban in 1266 A.D., they were more powerful than the ruler himself. By being conquerors of the territory, they had established the right to monopolise all positions of importance and to be deemed the aristocracy of the Turkish Empire in India.¹

The Sultān conferred ranks on them to confirm their official status. The status of a noble usually changed with the accession of a ruler. As a king was more often installed with the support of a powerful faction of the nobility, he would, out of gratitude raise the status of his supporters, while those who held power in the previous reign disappeared automatically.²

¹T.N., p.132, Mu'izzal-Din had remarked that after his death, his slaves would take care of his kingdom; Cf. Sir Wolseley Haig, op.cit., p.62, who says "During the reign of Ilāshah the leading Turks formed themselves into a 'College of Forty' and divided among themselves the great fiefs of the empire and all the highest offices in the state;" Cf. V.A.Smith, Oxford History of India (edition 1919), p.228, "He (Balban) refused to employ Hindu officials."

²T.N., p.170. The phrases, Mu'izzi Amīrs, Qutbi Amīrs, Shamsi Amīrs, etc. indicate that each group existed in the reign of a particular ruler.

Usually the highest rank held by a noble was that of Khān; the maliks and amīrs followed in descending order. All these indicated a military rank.¹ The term amīr, besides being a title, was also used as a general term applicable to any noble who held a civil or military office. Ranks like Ulugh Khān and Sipahsālār were rare. The title Sipahsalar was not exclusively meant for military personnel.²

Besides the general title, special algāb, such as Nizām ul mulk, 'Ayn ul mulk, Qiwām ul mulk, 'Imād ul mulk, Sadr-i jahān etc. were also awarded to civil officials for recognized services.³ In view of the military character of the state, no officer was spared from taking an active part in war in time of need. A noble would also be distinguished by being conferred a special robe, a sword, a number of horses, and elephants and naubat.⁴

Usually a noble commenced his career either as a slave of the king or of some other noble and until such time as he could reach some

¹ Baranī, p.145. The ranks signify how the Turkish army was modelled under the Delhi Sultāns - Ten horsemen should be put under one sar-khail; ten sar-khails under one sipahsālār, ten sipahsālārs under one amīr, ten amīrs under one malik; ten maliks under one khān; and at least ten khāns under the king. Baranī's figure is purely imaginary, as the cavalry-strength of the king becomes on such reckoning one million; Cf. Otto Spies, op.cit., p.67, who says, In India the khān has under him 10,000 riders, the malik 1,000 the amīr 100, and the sipahsālār less than that; Cf. H.H Howarth, History of the Mongols, part I pp.108-9, who says, under the Mongols the highest unit was 10,000 horsemen called 'tuman'.

² T.N., p.170; Minhāj says, Sipahsālār 'Alī Ismā'īl, the chief justice of Delhi, along with other Amīrs invited Iletmish from Badā'un.

³ T.N., pp.186-187; Baranī, p.410; Cf. N.Manucci, Storia du Mogor, trans. W.Irvine, Vol.II, p.369; Manucci says "The king confers these names either as a mark of distinction and of the esteem he holds them in for reasons of their services, or else from friendship and liking."

⁴ Tāj u'l Ma'āthir, I.O. 1486, f 55a; Cf. T.N., p.173; Nizām ul mulk Junaidī, the wazīr was given charge of the Bhakkar expedition.

position of importance he had to struggle for his existence.¹ The important political offices which the nobles held were those of court officers and provincial governors. The high posts were usually the preserve of the khāns and maliks. The posts held by the amīrs, though relatively less important than those of the khāns and maliks, nevertheless carried the prospect of attaining to a higher rank.

There was no fixed rule for awarding a position either at the court or in the provinces. It was at the pleasure of the king that a noble's rank could increase or his privileges diminish and be brought to an end.² Neither a noble's title nor his office was hereditary. These could remain his possession during his life-time, but if the king desired the office could be revoked at any time.³

A noble who enjoyed the confidence of the ruler was given an important office in the court and made to remain near him. For preserving the territorial integrity of the kingdom, a ruler usually posted either his son or one of his highly trusted nobles to the frontier provinces.⁴

¹ Siyāsat nāma, pp.109-110; Nizām al mulk prescribes a rigorous training of seven years for a slave before being given any position, and says, in no case should anyone be made an amīr and posted to a province before the age of thirty five; W.H. Moreland, Agrarian System of Moslem India, p.217.

² T.N., pp.231-324; Siyāsatnāma, pp.34-40. See the story of the army commander and Nushirwan the Just; Iletmish tried to observe some criterion in the promotion of his officers, although, at times, it was arbitrary.

³ T.N., p.226; The offices though not hereditary were quite often assigned to the heirs of the deceased. In 1259 A.D., when Shaikh u'l Islām Jamāl ud-Dīn Bustāmi, Qādi Kabīr ud-Dīn, and Aybek Kashhī Khān died, their posts were given to their sons.

⁴ T.N., p.169; Qutb ud-Dīn Aybek posted Iletmish, whom he called his son near the throne; Cf. P. Saran, Studies in Medieval Indian History, p.209, where it is said, Balban appointed "as wardens of the marches tried and experienced military hands such as his cousin Shīr Khān Sunqur, the most distinguished warrior of the age, who had been since the time of Iletmish governor of Bhatinda, Bhatnir, Sanām and Sāmāna which gave him control of the junction points of all the main routes from the west and the north western frontiers."

The contemporary accounts give little information about the total number of nobles during the Sultanate period. Minhāj has furnished the careers of twenty-five nobles and has, also, mentioned some others about whom nothing much has been said. Baranī, also, does not give any definite figure. Amīr Khusrau states that Mu'izz-ud-Dīn Kaiqubād possessed five thousand nobles,¹ which seems to be an exaggeration. In any case, it appears that he had inherited them from his grandfather Ghīyāth ud-Dīn. Balban, as he on his own part, was incapable of organizing such a large body of nobles, having devoted his short reign (1287-1290 A.D.) to revelry and dissipation. His ambitious Dādbak, Nizām ud-Dīn, was also not expected to let him build a band of supporters for himself as it would jeopardise his own position.²

Minhāj and Baranī both seem to lay much emphasis on heredity as the criterion of nobility but the fact remains that most of the Turks who had come to India with the first onrush of Muslim invasion were men of unknown origin.³ Speaking about the first generation of Turks in India, Ḥabīb says, "Coming from a Central Asian region of which few of them had the faintest recollection and to which none of them

¹ T.N., pp.177-8; 206; 231-324; Cf. Baranī, p.26; Amīr Khusrau, Qirān us Sa'dain, p.27.

² Baranī, pp.156-164; Qirān us Sa'dain, pp.154,160; Bughrā Khan while parting whispered to his son Kaiqubād to get rid of evil counsellors like Nizām ud-Dīn.

³ T.N., p.300; Turks of pure lineage and Tājiks of noble birth could not tolerate that 'Imad ud-Dīn of the tribes of Hind should rule over (them) the high-born chiefs; Baranī, p.29-30; Tārīkh-i Fakhr ud-Dīn Mubārak Shah, p.36. The author, an ardent admirer of the Turks, says, "When in their own country they are merely a tribe among other tribes and enjoy no particular power or status."

hoped or wished to return, and with no childhood memories to sweeten their lives except what they remembered of the families of the slave-merchants who had brought them up they were the citizens of all lands and any land."¹

During the early period, the nobles were composed of four groups: the Turks, the Tājiks, the Khaljīs, and the Indians.

In the beginning of Muslim rule almost all nobles were of Turkish origin.² Fakhr-i Mudabbir calls the Turks the proudest race in the world.³ This much is at least true, that the Turks considered themselves superior not only to the conquered people of India, but also to other non-Turks who had come to live and occupy eminent positions in the Sultanate. Being subordinate to one other than a Turk was considered as a great insult by them. The Raudat us-Safā says that Raḍīya had appointed Jamāl ud-Dīn yāqūt, the Abyssinian, to lead the army against Altūniya, but he was killed by the Turks who were members of the army.⁴ Whatever be the real cause of the grudge against Jamāl ud-Dīn, the leadership of the Abyssinian excited their animosity more against him.

¹ M. Habib, 'Introduction', History of India as told by its hown historians, Elliot and Dowson, Vol. II, (1952 edition), p. 99.

² T.N., p. 124; Minhāj also uses the term 'Turk' in the sense of a nomadic group; In the Qābusnāma, pp. 64-65, we read "A Turk has a large head, a broad face, narrow eyes, a flat nose and unpleasing lips and teeth. Regarded individually the features are not so handsome, yet the whole is handsome. Without any doubt what is fine in the Turks is present in a superlative degree, but so also what is ugly in them. They are brave, free from pretence, open in enmity and zealous in any task allotted to them. For the domestic establishment there is no better race."

³ Tārīkh-i Fakhr ud-Dīn Mubārak Shah, p. 37.

⁴ Mir Khwand, Raudat us Safā, Vol. IV, f. 521b.

It was during the time of Caliph al-Muta'sim that the Turks came to dominate the political life of the Islāmic world. The Turks had approached the western outskirts of India in the tenth century.¹ Bosworth says, "The Ghaznavid army was a great stronghold of Turkish nationality and feeling, for a considerable proportion of it was Turkish."² Their constant flow from Central Asia to the Islamic Empire in the East was in line with their penetrating into areas further east, as and when opportunities were to be provided.

The adventurous spirit of the Turks on leaving their hearth and homes, which they usually did at an early age, gave them the opportunity to gain a place of distinction by showing their skill in the art of war. Gibbon says, "It is useless to praise the valour of a Turk."³ Another writer comments that renunciation of homes and relatives by the Turks was one of the processes of their becoming amīrs and generals.⁴ To this may be added the zeal for their new religion where at least they were guaranteed social equality, irrespective of what their ancestors might have been. Fakhr-i-Mudabbir states that unlike other races the Turks have never apostatized.⁵

¹ Sir W. Muir, The Caliphate, p. 513.

² The Ghaznavids, p. 56.

³ M. Ḥabīb, op. cit., p. 99, says, "The Turkish slave aristocracy was never found wanting in the field of battle"; The Ghaznavids, p. 108, where it is said, "War was the obvious field in which to employ the Turks."

⁴ Tārīkh-i-Fakhr ud-Dīn Mubārak Shah, p. 36, where it is said, "From the days of Adam till the present day no purchased slave has ever become a king, except the Turks."

⁵ Ibid., p. 36.

This seems true, as the Turks owed their elevated status to their new religion which undoubtedly they would forfeit if they reverted to their original faith. Minhāj, also, conveys the impression that almost all Turks were converts. In the case of a noble named Badr ud-Dīn Sunqur Rūmī, he makes a significant statement 'being a muslim he had become a slave.'¹

The hard life to which they had been accustomed from their early days had, it seems, dried their milk of human kindness. Instances such as the massacre of Tājiks and the inhuman punishment to servants furnish proof of their cruel nature.²

Baranī calls the Turkish aristocracy of the days of Iletmish as the Turkān-i-Chehlqānī (The Forty Turks).³ It can by no means be assumed that the number of the nobles was restricted to the small figure of forty. It seems that the term Chehlqānī was adopted by a militant group consisting of forty Turks who had resolved on resisting interference from the non-Turks in the affairs of government. Minhāj does not use the term at all.

The Tājiks - The term 'Tājik' does not apply to any race. In the general and sociological sense it is used to mean non-Turks. According to Dr D'Ohsson 'the Mongols gave the name 'Tājiks'

¹ T.N., p.254.

² Baranī, p.40; Cf. T.N., p.183; In the Qābūsnāma, p.64; we read: The general faults of the Turks are that they are blunt-witted, ignorant, boastful, turbulent, discontented and without a sense of justice. Without any cause they will create trouble and utter foul language, and at night they are poor-hearted.

³ Baranī, p.28.

to Muhammadans and used it particularly for the non-Turks.¹

Nizām ul mulk uses the term 'Tājik' for civil officials, the ahl-i galam.² According to Minhāj, the 'Tājiks' were non-Turks but he does not include the Khaljis and Indians in that category.³ Like Nizām ul mulk, he also means civil officials by the term Tājik.

Bosworth says, the Persians used the term 'Tājik' in order to distinguish themselves from their Turkish rulers.⁴ Baranī does not expressly mention the word 'Tājik' but means them when he speaks of the free-born maliks and dignitaries who had adorned the reign of Iltutmish.⁵ Ikrām says, "Tājiks are Persian speaking Turks who had migrated from Turkish homelands earlier and differed from the Turks in several national characteristics. The term Tājik was originally used for the Arabs, particularly the Arab conquerors of Central Asia. Later it was loosely used for the Persian speaking people of eastern Irān, Ghor and the adjacent territories, irrespective of their ethnic origins."⁶ From the accounts of Minhāj and Baranī, it appears that

¹ Mirza Muhammad Haidar Dughlat, Tārīkh-i-Rashīdī, p.85, (quoted by N. Elias)

² Siyāsatnāma, p.153.

³ T.N., p.253, Minhāj says, on account of the favour shown to the Abyssinian all nobles, Turks, Ghoris and Tājiks were afflicted.

⁴ The Ghaznavids, p.304, n.37.

⁵ Baranī, p.26; "mulūk-i ahrār wa mu'arīf-i ashraf rā ki pīsh-i takht-i-Shamsi namwar wa mu'tabir budand." (The free-born maliks and dignitaries, who were famous and respected before the Shamsi throne.)

⁶ S.M.Ikrām, History of Muslim Civilisation, p.59 and n.a.; A.K.S. Lambton, Landlord and Peasant, p.57, Tājik is used as a general term for a non-Turk.

Tājiks were emigrants from Central Asia who, on account of their rich administrative experience, were appointed to important civil posts, and who also held sway in the literary and intellectual fields. Their predominance in the administrative hierarchy made the Turks jealous and intent on their destruction.

Khaljīs - Sir Wolseley Haig calls the Khaljīs a Turkish tribe, who on account of having long settled in the hot region of Afghanistān had probably acquired Afghān manners and customs.¹ Other scholars like Raverty, Barthold and Minorsky,² also regard the Khaljīs as Turkish in origin. Bosworth is of the view that the Khalaj Turks were the fragments of those Turkish peoples who had been brought from the north of the Oxus as part of the Ephthalite confederation and were left over in Eastern Afghanistān.³

Evidence exists about the presence of the Khaljīs in the Helmund valley of Afghanistān during the ninth and tenth centuries.⁴

Baranī clearly distinguishes the Khaljīs from the Turks. He says as the Khaljīs "belonged to a race different from the Turks, so he

¹ Sir W. Haig, op. cit., p. 92.

² Hudūd al-'alam, Trans. by V. Minorsky, p. 348, who quotes a passage from the manuscript of Muḥammad b. Najīb, Bakram (f. 17) written circa A.D. 1200-20; "The Khalaj are a tribe of Turks who from the Khullukh limits migrated to Zabulistān. Among the districts of Ghazna there is a steppe where they reside. Then on account of the heat of the air their complexion has changed and tend all towards blackness, the language too has undergone alterations and become a different dialect. By mistake the people call the Khullukh Khalj."

³ The Ghaznavids, pp. 35-6.

⁴ Sīyāsat nāma, p. 112. Nizām ul mulk says that once Alptigin deputed two hundred pages, which included Sebuktigin to collect some money from the Khalaj Turks and Turkmans.

(Jalāl ud-Dīn Khaljī) had no faith in them (the Turks), neither would the Turks recognize them (the Khaljīs) as belonging to their own group. "¹ Minhāj, also, does not identify the Khaljīs with the Turks. Describing the Tibet expedition, he says, Bakhtiyār Khaljī appointed two amīrs to guard the bridge, one was a Turk slave and the other a Khaljī. "²

From the statement of Baranī that the people of Delhi disliked the Khaljīs as they believed them to be of non-Turkish stock, it could be assumed that by the end of the thirteenth century the Khaljīs had lost their Turkish characteristics; as a result they were distinguished from the Turks. "³

The Khaljīs were also good warriors. In the army of Mu'izzal-Dīn, they were in substantial strength. In the first battle of Tara'in (1191 A.D.) it was a young Khaljī who rescued Mu'izzal-Dīn from the battlefield and saved his life. "⁴

The Khaljīs were not slaves like the Turks. Muḥammad Bakhtiyār Khaljī, the founder of Muslim rule in Bengal had come to Ghazna about 1196-97 A.D. in search of employment as a soldier in the army of Mu'izzal-Dīn, where being rejected, he proceeded to the court of Aybek at Delhi with the same intention. Here also on account of his short

¹ Baranī, pp.171-3; says, by the death of Kaiqubād the Turks lost their kingdom, which passed to the Khaljīs.

² T.N., (edited Chughtai), p.65.

³ The Ghaznavids, p.36; K.R. Qanungoe, 'Race, parentage and dates of Muḥammad Bakhtiyār Khalji, History of Bengal, Vol.II, p.30. (University of Dacca publications), says, "It is therefore nearer the truth to call the Khaljīs Turkman or Tartar by ethnic origin."

⁴ T.N. (edited Chughtai), p.34.

stature, ill-favoured appearance, long arms and being without the means to provide himself with a horse and a suit of armour he had to face disappointment. From Delhi he moved eastward to Badaun where Malik Hizbar ud-Din, the sipahsalar, offered him an appointment. After some time he joined the services of Husam ud-Din, the governor of Awadh, who assigned to him the territories of Bhagwat and Bhiuli for his maintenance.¹ This helped him to carve out for himself the kingdom of Lakhnauti, the easternmost province of Delhi, which seemed independent in outward appearance, but remained an appanage of the Delhi Sultanate until 1210 A.D. After the death of Qutb ud-Din Aybek (1210 A.D.), the Khaljis declared themselves independent but the king of Delhi was unwilling to tolerate their sovereign status. Ikhtiyar ud-Din Balka Khalji was the last independent king of Lakhnauti; he was defeated and killed by Iltutmish in 1230-31 A.D.²

The Khaljis rose to real power on the ruins of Balban's dynasty, in 1290 A.D. when they brought to an end the domination of the Turkish aristocracy. Their ascendancy marked the turning point in the socio-political history of India. With the decline of the Turks, the long-awaited Indian Muslims fast established themselves on the political

¹ T.N. (edited Chughtai), p.60; T.A., Vol.I, pp.46-7.

² T.N., pp.159,174, 'Ali Mardān was the first Khalji to declare his sovereignty at Lakhnauti in 1210 A.D.; T.A., Vol.I, p.53, where it is said that after the death of Qutb ud-Din, 'Ali Mardān assumed the royal canopy, had the Khutbah read and sikka struck in his own name, and styled himself Sultan 'Ala ud-Din.

scene. The Khaljī reign though comprising only thirty years (1290-1320 A.D.) found the Muslim power at its zenith, when vast areas to the south of Vindya Range where no Muslim ruler had yet directed his arms, came to be conquered.¹

The Indians: - Since the days of Iletmish some of the Indian Muslims, evidently converts, had come to occupy important positions in the Delhī Sultanate, and even became nobles.² Baranī states that Iletmish was meticulous in assigning posts to persons of high birth. Having discovered thirty-three men of obscure origin in his secretariat, he ordered their dismissal. On the instigation of Malik 'Izz ud-Dīn Sālārī and Malik Qutb ud-Dīn Hussain Ghorī, he also ordered an enquiry to be instituted into the parentage of his minister Nizām ul mulk Junaidī, who was found to belong to a weaver's family.³ Iletmish would have hardly dared to dismiss thirty-three Turks, and neither 'Izz ud-Dīn Sālārī nor Qutb ud-Dīn Hussain would suggest an investigation into the origin of a high official like the wazīr, if he came of the Turkish stock. Those who had come from central Asia under Mongol pressure were, according to Mihhāj, Baranī and 'Isāmī, men of noble extraction, while the Khaljīs had by now

¹ Baranī, p.173. Baranī says about Sultān Jalāl ud-Dīn Khaljī, the first Khaljī ruler of Delhī in 1290 A.D. "He (Jalāl ud-Dīn), out of fear of the citizens did not go to Delhī because the inhabitants of the city could not accept this change of dynasty in their heart of hearts. In the History of Muslim Civilisation, p.74, we read: "By the end of 'Alā ud-Dīn's reign converts like Malik Kafur were occupying the highest position in the state. Apparently the efforts of the Muslim missionaries and ṣūfis had begun to bear fruit and a sizeable number of Muslim converts were available for the services of the state.

² T.N., p.177; In the reign of Iletmish, Mihhāj mentions an Indian noble named Malik 'Izz ud-Dīn 'Alī Siālkotī.

³ Baranī, pp.38-9.

clustered around their own chief at Lakhnauti.¹

It seems Iletmish had become apprehensive that the local elements would soon come to the forefront and rival the power of the Turks. His racial prejudices, therefore, urged him to make birth a pretext for curbing the growing strength of the Indian faction in the Court.

As Islām disapproved of any social distinction on the score of birth, such an attitude was most unexpected from a ruler like Iletmish, who had earned a high reputation for his saintly virtues.²

In spite of being consistently suppressed by the Turkish aristocracy, the Indian Muslims came to the forefront in 1253 A.D., during the reign of Nāṣir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd, when the too powerful Balban with his entire body of supporters was ousted from the court and 'Imād ud-Dīn Rayḥān, an Indian Muslim, for whom no amount of derogatory language by Minhāj could be sufficient, came to assume the control of affairs.³ The policy of placing a new king on the throne with the

¹ T.N., (edited by Chughtai), p.60; Baranī, p.27; 'Iṣāmī, pp.109-110.

² T.N., p.167; Fawā'id ul Fawā'id, op.cit., p.173, where it is said that Nizām ud-Dīn Auliya had once told his audience that Iletmish had found access to Shaikh Shihāb ud-Dīn Suhrawardī and Shaikh Auhad ud-Dīn Kirmānī, and one of them had predicted that he would become a king.

³ T.N., pp.216, 217, 297-303.

advent of a new powerful faction was not continued by Rayhān which cost him his life, and also temporarily eclipsed the Indian influence.

The Indian Muslims were prominent in the reign of the Khaljīs, and under the patronage of Muḥammad Tughlaq they were sufficiently strong.¹ In the reign of Fīrūz Tughlaq the Indian Muslims became the dominating force in the political scene.²

It may be said that most of Baranī's Fatwah-i-Jahāndārī (Decree on the rules of Government) is a lamentation on the rise of the Indians in the political sphere of the Delhi Sultanate.

The functions of the nobles may be divided into three broad categories: Court officials; Army officers; and Provincial governors.

The court served as a nursery to train men for higher offices. From this nursery the Sultān picked his officers and attached them to the court. When a responsible court officer forfeited the confidence of the king he was deprived of his office and transferred to his iqṭā' if he commanded a following.³

¹ Baranī, p. 503, 'Azīz Ḥimār, whom Baranī calls low born, was appointed by Muḥammad Tughlaq to the governorship of Malwa and its dependencies.

² Afif, pp. 400, 425-426. Khān-i Jahān Maqbūl, a native of Telingāna was the wazīr of Fīrūz Tughlaq. About him the Sultān would often say: "Khān-i Jahān is the grand and magnificent king of Delhi." When Khān-i Jahān died, his son succeeded him in the same post.

³ T.N., pp. 194, 255; Although Mu'izz ud-Dīn Bahām had himself detected Badr ud-Dīn Sunqur discussing his dethronement; on account of Sunqur's influence in the court, the king could not punish him more than by sending him forthwith to his iqṭā' of Badaun.

As the Delhi Sultanate was organised on a military basis, every official, irrespective of the character of his assignment was required to be enrolled in the army list. Every person who came either with the invading army or joined the Turkish Conquerors of India as an adventurer formed a part of the Muslim soldiery. Thus the army of the Turkish rulers in India somewhat resembled the citizen-army of the early Islamic period when the entire Muslim population was required to take up arms at the hour of need.¹

The Sultan was the de facto commander-in-chief of the army but sometimes he appointed a deputy to assist him in his work.² There is no direct reference to the various ranks of the army but some available evidence suggests the existence of a military hierarchy.³

The army maintained at the capital, though usually small in number, was the rulers reserve force which he employed for putting down internal rebellions, repelling foreign invasions and, also, for relieving provincial governors when besieged by an aggressor with whom the local force had proved unable to cope.⁴

1 G. Yazdānī, Epigraphia Indo Moslemica, 1913-14. 'The Inscriptions of the Turk Sultāns of Delhi'. In 1245-46 A.D., Ṣalah ud-Dīn Abul-Mahmūd al-Hussain, an old man of ninety eight, fought against the Mongols at Uchch.

2 T.N. p.187; In the reign of Raḍīya, Saif ud-Dīn Aybek was appointed the na'ib-i lashkar, and was given the title of Qutlugh Khān.

3 Ādāb ul mulūk wa kifāyat ul mamlūk, I.O. 647, f826. In the description of a military review by the 'Arid it is mentioned "Every soldier had an assigned place"; T.N., pp. 317-318. Minhāj says, two hundred thousand footmen and fifty thousand cavalry besides others, were arranged in order for receiving the Mongol emissary.

4 'Afif, p.298. In the reign of Fīrūz Tughlaq, eighty thousand soldiers were paid throughout the year; Baranī, p.55. Hulāgu described Balban's hunting excursions, in which the cavalry and infantry accompanied him, a pretext for exercising his troops in order to keep them fit

It also avoided the risk of depending entirely on the army raised by the nobles and provincial governors for meeting an emergent situation. A strong army at the capital was an indispensable need in those turbulent days, when a slight pretext was enough¹ for like-minded nobles to combine and march against the Sultān. Radīya felt herself helpless when she was besieged by four hostile provincial governors in 1236 A.D., and sought the aid of the governor of Awadh. She however succeeded in dealing with the situation with the assistance of the army that was directly under her² control.

Minhāj leaves us in no doubt that Nāṣir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd marched his forces from Delhī towards Sām against Balban and³ other nobles in 1254 A.D., unaided by any provincial governor.

Balban had assigned the charge of the armed forces to his rāwat-i-'ard, and exalted his rank above other nobles. He thus emphasized the importance of the military organization in his kingdom. The rāwat also responded to the wishes of the ruler by giving his undivided attention to the conditions of the soldiery.

1 Baranī, pp.86, 508. For meeting a particular situation a Sultān would order emergency recruitment from the local people; against Tughril, Balban ordered a general levy at Awadh, when 200,000 men of all classes were enrolled; when Muhammad Tughlaq appointed Shaikh Mu'izz ud-Dīn as the nā'ib of Gujerāt, he ordered 300,000 tankas to be paid to the Shaikh to enable him to raise a thousand horse within two or three days, which would accompany the royal army against the rebels of Gujerāt.

2 T.N., p.186.

3T.N., p.219.

His approach in dealing with the problems of the army was one of extreme kindness and affection. Barani says the rāwat would call himself the guardian of the kingdom, whose duty was to spend day and night in providing comfort to the soldiers and in treating them better than his brothers and sons, failing which he would¹ prove untrue to his salt and feel ashamed before God.

Pandey is of the opinion that the effort of Muslim rulers to keep their army efficient and strong did not meet with success. His view does not appear to be sound, when it is realised that one of the greatest conquerors of the world, Chengīz Khān, could not march into Delhi although he had approached as far as the Indus, and that subsequent Mongol invasions also bore no fruit.² The stable military condition of India under the Turkish rule is indicated by the fact that in 1260 A.D., Hulagū, who was stationed at 'Irāq,³ decided to seek the friendship of the Delhi Sultanate.

According to the Masālik ul Absār, the army of Muhammad Tughlaq, consisted of 900,000 horsemen, a figure that is open to

1 Baranī, pp. 115-116; Balban in his advice to his sons, time and again stressed the importance of the army, 'Kingship is not possible without justice, beneficence, pomp, army and treasury'. (Baranī, p.77); 'Keep the army, subjects, and the merchants, happy and affluent'. (Baranī, p.79); 'A king should be careful about regular payment of salaries to his soldiers'. (Baranī, p.100); 'A king should know that on the maintenance of a large army depends the permanence and stability of his authority. The condition of the army should be reported daily to the king.' (Baranī, p.102).

2 A.B. Pandey, Society and Government in Medieval India, p.28; Cf P. Saran, Studies in Medieval Indian History, p.210, who says, "During the reign of Kaiqubad, there was another invasion under Tamar Khān of Ghazna, in which the Mughals (Mongols) carried rapine and plunder as far as Sāmāna but the well organized defence measures set up by the late Sultān (Balban), were still strong enough, and the Mughals were once more vanquished with terrible loss to their numbers".

3 T.N., p.322.

question. Hypothetically the infantry should have been still
¹ more. That the Sultāns of Delhī were always anxious to have
 a well-organised military potential, on account of the inherent
 dangers, cannot be denied.

At a period when means of fast communication were not
 developed it was difficult for the Central Government to exercise
 authority over the distant territories. In order to solve this
 problem, the kingdom was divided into a number of iqṭā's, large
 and small; the large ones remaining administrative units under
 governors called muqṭa's, while the smaller ones were assigned
² to individual troopers to provide for their means of subsistence.

The assignment of iqṭā's was no novel idea of the thirteenth
 century. R. Levy on the authority of Balādhuri³ says that grants
 of lands were made in the days of the earliest caliphs. Lambton
 states that the iqṭā' system emerged as a necessity during the
 'Abbasid period when the citizen army was replaced by the
 mercenaries. The Buwayhids used to grant lands to their officers
⁴ in lieu of pay. But they did not take any step to remove the

1 Masālik ul Absār fi Mamālik ul Amsār, Quoted in History of India as told by its own historians, Vol. III, p.576, where it is said "The army of Muḥammad Tughlaq consists of 900,000 horsemen, some of whom are stationed near the prince, and the rest are distributed in the various provinces of the empire".

2 T.N., pp. 231-324; cf 'Afif, pp. 296-297.

3 R. Levy, The Social Structure of Islam, p. 413, refers to Balādhuri, Futuh al-Buldan, ed. M.J. de Goeje, Leyden 1866, pp. 128, 255 f.

4 A.K.S. Lambton, Landlord and Peasant, pp.49-50, where it is said, "the rapid expansion of the Arab empire had put a certain strain upon its internal structure. By the tenth century A.D., this was becoming apparent in the breakdown of the lands of the eastern Caliphate. Some new basis had to be found to replace the gold economy. This basis was land"; M. Kabir, The Buwayhids, p.12.

abuses that had crept into the iqṭā' system since the eleventh century A.D.

1

The Seljuqs, however, streamlined the assignment system.

As they were not rich enough to pay their troops, in order to meet their financial obligations they made an extensive use of the system

2

of grants. According to Barthold, it was the prosperous agricultural condition under the Sāmānids which enabled them to pay their

3

troops in cash. The Ghaznavids, also, made cash payments to

their army as their treasury had been replenished with the wealth

4

of India. On the authority of Hieun Tsang, Ghoshāl says, the

system of granting assignments to the ministers of state and other

5

officials in return for their services had existed in Ancient India.

Like the Seljuqs, who employed trained Turkish slaves and freed men for running the administration, the Turkish rulers in India, also entrusted the government of the various parts of the kingdom to members of the dominant group, chiefly the Turks, who

1 Lambton, op.cit. p.53, says "The Seljuqs regularized the position of the muqṭā' and brought order into the iqṭā' system, which became the dominant feature in the field of land-tenure and land-revenue administration for many years to come."

2 Ar-Rāwandī, Rāhat al-Sudūr, ed. Md Iqbāl (London 1921) p.127.

3 Barthold, ^{op.cit.} p.238; R. Levy, The Social Structure of Islam, pp. 374, 384, where it is said, under the Samanids, taxation was light, the government had stability, and the administration was well organized.

4 The Ghaznavids, pp.124, 125.

5 U.N. Ghoshāl, Agrarian System in Ancient India, p.49.

1

came to be styled as mugta's or wālīs.

Scholars like Moreland, Qureshī and some others have tried to discover the distinctions between mugta' and wālī.

Moreland on the authority of Abū yūsuf calls wālī an Islamic term for a bureaucratic governor, and says he has not come across the terms mugta' or iqta' in the early Islamic literature. He suggests that the term wālī and mugta' were perhaps used in India in the sense that a wālī had no obligation to maintain troops, while a ²mugta' was required to do so.

While rejecting the view of Qānūngoe that the term wilāyat was used for a distant province and iqta' for one that was near the capital, as Baranī indiscriminately uses the terms for any province whether near or far, he suggests that perhaps there was a minor difference in their position, such as in the accounts procedure of the Revenue Ministry. ³Qureshī is of the view that the wālī was higher in status than the mugta', as the former term was used for a governor with extraordinary powers while the latter was ⁴applied to any governor.

1 T.N., p.297; Baranī, pp.82, 96; Lambton, op.cit., p.56

2 W.H. Moreland, the Agrarian System of Moslem India, p.222.

3 Ibid, pp. 221-222; Baranī, pp.58, 584. Baranī calls Badā'un, which was near Delhi, wilāyat', and Multān, the western-most province, 'iqta'.

4 Administration of the Sultānate of Delhi, p.186.

As used in the Tabagāt-i-Nāsirī and Baranī's Tārīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī, the two terms walī and mugta' are synonymous. Baranī calls the governor of Lakhnautī walī and amīr, while Minhāj ~~was~~¹ the term mugta' for the governor of the same territory.

Throughout the Sultanate period the governor of Lakhnautī seems to have enjoyed a privileged position in relation to the governors of other provinces. Evidently, Lakhnautī's long distance and difficult communication with the capital obliged the ruler of Delhi to appoint a loyal and trustworthy noble to its charge. When Balban assigned the administration of Lakhnautī to his second son, Bughrā Khān, he counselled him to give up his lewd practises, as it was an important province. "If on the day of judgment I am asked why the governorship of such a kingdom, and the kingship of such a distant territory was assigned to a debauchee, what could my answer be". Baranī calls Lakhnautī ² Bulghākpūr (the abode of rebellion). The abundance of resources

1 Baranī, pp.82, 95-96; (The Tārīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī, ed. by Shaikh 'Abdur Rashīd, p.99, has amīr instead of the amīr of Bib. Indica series. Both terms, however, mean 'governor'); Cf T.N., p.242; A.M. Hussain, The Rise and Fall of Muhammad bin Tughlaq, pp. 28, 29, n.5; Dr. Hussain is of the opinion that the mugta' was politically lower than or subordinate to the walī.

2 Baranī, pp.82, 93. Baranī explains why Lakhnautī is called the 'dwelling-place of rebellion'. "Since Mu'izz al-Dīn conquered Delhi, every governor of Lakhnautī has taken advantage of the difficulties and of the distance of the road to rebel. If they did not rebel themselves, others rebelled against them, killed them and seized the territory."

which had made Lakhnautī independent of the central authority for its needs tempted its governor to throw off the yoke of Delhi.

A muqta¹ was appointed by the king, and he could dismiss or transfer him to another iqta¹ at his pleasure. Out of the twenty five biographies of nobles furnished by Minhāj, almost all who rose to the rank of muqta had to go through graduated stages.

As the office of muqta carried immense responsibility it was the practice of the king to appoint men of experience and tested ability to the charge of administrative iqta²'s.

Minhāj says that Malik Naṣīr ud-Dīn Ayetmar was initially appointed sar-i jāndār by Iletmish, and after sometime, on his rendering satisfactory service was assigned the iqta of Lāhore. Regarding another noble, 'Izz ud-Dīn Tughril Tughān Khān, he mentions that he served Iletmish in the capacity of sāqī-i-Khāṣ, dawāt-dār and Chāshnigīr, and it took him a long time to become the amīr-i-ākḥur³, whereafter he was made the muqta of Badaūn.

Important provinces were usually assigned to the heir-apparent. The object was to cultivate in the prince a sense of

1 Baranī, pp.96-97; T.N., pp.217, 220. 'Imād ud-Dīn Rayhān and Balban were transferred from one iqta to another in quick succession.

2 W.H. Moreland, The Agrarian System of Moslem India, where it is said, p.218. "what we see is a royal household full of slaves, who could rise, by merit or favour, from se⁵ vile duties to the charge of a province, or even of a kingdom.

3 T.N., pp.242.^{236,}

responsibility and, also, to acquaint him with the problems of kingship. Iletmish had entrusted to the charge of his eldest son, Nāsir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd, the frontier provinces of ¹ Lāhore (1217 A.D.) and Lakhnautī (1227-1228 A.D.). Balban had appointed his eldest son, Prince Muḥammad, popularly known as Khān-i-Shahīd (Martyr Prince) to the charge of Sind with over-all command of the north-western frontier, and to his younger son, Bughrā Khān, he had assigned the frontier iqṭā's of Sāmāna and Sanām. Barani says the object of their appointment was achieved as, thereafter, they obtained several victories ² over the Mongols.

Although assignment of iqṭā's was the exclusive privilege of the Sultān, it seems that nobles of the court and muḥṭā's had implied authority from the ruler to assign lands or villages to their trusted men. Such assignments did not carry any administrative responsibility. When Badr ud-Dīn Sunqur became the amīr-i ḥājib, he granted to Balban, who held the ³ post of amīr-i ākhur, the iqṭā' of Riwārī to the east of Delhi.

1 Tāj ul Ma'āthir, I.O. 1486, f.248a; T.N., p.181.

2 Baranī, pp. 80-81.

3 T.N., pp. 285, 295; Balban granted a village to Minhāj which yielded an income of thirty thousand jitals annually. From the language of Minhāj, "the gift (of thirty thousand jitals) comes annually to this sincere well-wisher," it is clear that there was no administrative obligation; Baranī, p.80; Balban instructed his son Bughrā Khān to assign iqṭā's to trusted and loyal officers, 'Afif, p.96. Fīrūz Tughlaq gave the grant a hereditary character. He allowed the iqṭā'-holders to bequeath their iqṭā's to their sons, near relations and even slaves.

Qutb ud-Din Aybek enumerated the following functions for the mugta', when he appointed Malik ul Umarā Husām ud-Dīn¹ to the charge of Kolā.

- 1) to demolish the idols of that region,
- 2) to enforce the laws and regulations of Islām,
- 3) to enhance the status of 'Ulamā,
- 4) to be mindful of the welfare of the subjects,
- 5) to administer justice and protect the weak from being oppressed by the strong,
- 6) to maintain the efficiency of the army and to provide for the well-being of the troops,
- 7) to wage a holy war against the infidels and destroy them,
- 8) to guard the highways and punish the offenders, also, to maintain law and order in the province.

Iletmish's instructions to his eldest son Nāsir ud-Dīn Mahmūd, when he was appointed governor of Lahore in 1218 A.D.,² hardly differ in details from that of Qutb ud-Dīn Aybek. Such directives provide only the ideal, as in practice the mugta's functions were different. His main responsibility was to collect revenue from his territory, use the sanctioned expenditure for himself and for the maintenance of his troops, and remit

1 Tāj ul Ma'āthir, I.O., 1486, f.126b.

2 Tāj ul Ma'āthir, I.O., 1486, ff. 248.

the surplus to the royal court.¹ He had complete authority to recruit his own contingent of troops and to appoint army officers for dealing with the local situation. When Balban appointed Bughrā Khān as governor of Sāmāna and Sanām he directed him to increase the allowances of the old soldiers and to enlist twice as many more new men. He was told to be particularly careful in the appointment of his army officers who should be competent to repel any Mongol aggression.²

The system of the recruitment to the army by the nobles continued throughout the thirteenth century and even later. Minhāj says the Khaljīs, hearing of the good fortune and affluence of Bakhtiyār Khaljī, rallied around him and joined his army.³ Even in the days of 'Alā ud-Dīn Khaljī when the army had become centralised and the soldiers remained in service throughout the year, being paid in cash, we are informed by Baranī that the nobles possessed their own troops.⁴

¹ Sīyasatnāma, pp.32-4. Nizām ul mulk says the mugtā's functions also included: keeping the people happy, the subjects light-burdened, not to oppress the weak, show respect to the learned, consort with the good, avoid the bad, and cause no harm to those who mind their own affairs; Baranī, p.220 says, When 'Alā ud-Dīn Khaljī was governor of Kara and Awadh, he requested Sultān Jalāl ud-Dīn Khaljī to postpone the demand for the surplus revenue (ḥawādil).

² Baranī, pp.80,81.

³ T.N., ed. Chughtai, p.60.

⁴ Baranī, p.328 says, In 1309 A.D. when Malik Kafūr marched towards Warrangal, the maliks and amirs of Hindustān, with their cavalry and infantry joined him at Chanderī, where a review was held; T.N. p.273; where it is said, When Nuṣrat Khān Badr ud-Dīn Sunqur became the amir of Kol, he exercised authority over his army and subjects in a just manner.

It was necessary to keep sufficient force in the provinces as they assisted in the collection of revenue, and also in exercising authority over the Hindū chiefs and the local population.¹ A mugta could on his own authority wage war with the independent Hindū rulers and extend his jurisdiction. Out of the spoils of victory the provincial governor was required to send a fifth share to the sovereign, which implied the permission of the ruler. Minhāj tells us that Malik Nusrat ud-Dīn was reinforced with contingents from other territories to make inroads into Kālinjar and Chanderī. In 1234 A.D. he ravaged these territories and the fifth share of the Sultān in fifty days came to twenty-five lakhs of ḍiḡāls.² The acquiescence of the ruler in the extension of territories by the mugta, had probably led a noble to conjecture that he had acquired right of conquest over the whole world. Minhāj gives an amusing story of a mugta. "Once a merchant who had become poor approached ʿAlī Mardān, the governor of Lakhnauti (1210-1211 A.D.), for financial help. The governor enquired the name of the country from which the merchant came; on being told that he belonged to Isfahān, the governor ordered the iqṭāʿ of Isfahān to be assigned to him. For fear of punishment no one could have the courage to tell him that Isfahān was not in his territory and if

¹ Society and Government in Medieval India, p.11, where it is said, Even after the coming of the Turks to India, "they had to be busy waging a ceaseless war because Rajput nobles and rulers allowed them no peace, while the Hindū chiefs within the Turkish sphere of influence withheld taxes as long as superior military force was not applied".

² T.N., p.240.

anyone said, so, he would retort, I will conquer it."¹

The mugta's force was to remain in readiness for responding to the call of the sovereign.² Non-compliance was tantamount to an act of rebellion for which the central authority when powerful, seldom hesitated to take punitive steps.³

As a convention, a mugta' was also required to bring presents when he visited the royal court which, perhaps, was once in a year. As such presents ensured the allegiance of the provincial governor to the sovereign, evidence exists that rulers insisted on their mugta's to be regular in sending presents. After crushing Tughlils rebellion at Lakhnauti, Balban appointed Bughrā Khān to its governorship, and he advised him to send presents from time to time to Delhi which should include some elephants.⁴ Fīrūz Tughlaq made an innovation in the system by allowing his mugta's to deduct the value of their presents from the revenue payable to the royal treasury.⁵

Besides the administrative iqta's, the other type of iqta's prevalent in the Seljuq period correspond somewhat with the Indian type. The practise of assigning iqta's to members of the royal family

¹ T.N., pp.159-160; Khwand Amīr, Habīb us Siyar, B.M., Add.27,237, Vol.II, f.477b, says "Alī Mardān was reputed for his lunacy."

² Lambton, op.cit., p.62. The author is of the view that during the Seljuq period the holder of an iqta' was obliged to furnish the sovereign with military contingents, in return for the money he received from the areas granted to him.

³ T.N., pp.311,312. Nāṣir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd had to march against two nobles, Arsalan Khān and Mas'ūd Jānī, for not assisting him with their troops against the Mongols.

⁴ Baranī. p.96.

⁵ Afif, pp.340-1.

without being given any specific responsibility does not seem to have existed in India. Iletmish's sons, who had been given iqta's, were governors of their respective provinces. Sultān Nāṣir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd, who had held the iqta' of Bahraich at the age of fifteen, was also responsible for its administration. After Balban was dismissed from the governorship of Hānsī, Prince Rukn ud-Dīn, whose relationship with the royal family is unknown, was assigned that territory with the post of amīr-i ḥājib.¹

Military iqta's were assigned to members of the standing army who were directly under the Sultān. They were entitled only to the produce of the iqta' so long as they remained in service.²

High officials, who were permanently stationed at the court were assigned extensive iqta's which they administered through their representatives.³ It was an old custom. In the 'Abbāsīd period, Bāyakkāk (Bābakyal) had been assigned a large tract of Egypt as his iqta', but as he lived at Baghdād he managed his estates through his agents, one of whom was Ahmad ibn Tulūn.⁴

¹ Lambton, op.cit., p.61; T.N., p.217.

² Lambton, op.cit., p.63, says, "military grants were made for services actually being rendered at the time." Cf. Elphinstone, History of India, p.81, who says, "Such (military) grants originate in the convenience of giving an assignment on a district near the station of the troops, instead of an order on the treasury, a mode of transfer particularly adapted to a country where the revenue is paid in kind."; Barant, p.62, says, Balban ordered the grants of the old and infirm troopers who had become unfit for service to be withdrawn and granted them a monthly allowance of forty to fifty tankas for their maintenance.

³ T.N., pp.214,286,295. Balban had been assigned the iqta' of Hānsī. The income of one of its villages was 30,000 jitals annually; Lambton, op.cit. p.63; Elphinstone, History of India, p.84.

⁴ R.Levy, The Social Structure of Islām, p.420.

During the reign of the Seljuq ruler Malik Shah, iqta's were assigned throughout the country to provide for the need of the army on campaigns.¹ In India, as the army was often on the march, the existence of such an arrangement is quite probable.

Iqta's were also granted as personal estates which were usually gifts for some faithful service.² Men of letters and holy men were granted lands of the nature of personal estates, in order to provide means for their subsistence.³

The mugta' was allowed independence in his internal administration, but his financial transactions were subject to the control of the Treasury.⁴ With the chaos prevailing after the death of Iletmish, when every mugta' considered himself equal to the ruler, as being ^{of} the same stock, it is doubtful if the Treasury could have exercised effective authority over the provincial governors. Minhaj informs us that in the year 1236 A.D. Ghiyath ud-Din the governor of Awadh, seized the revenues of Lakhnauti which were being sent to the capital. It is not known whether the Ministry could take effective steps for the recovery of the seized revenue.⁵

¹ Lambton, op.cit., p.64.

² Barani, p.62. The two thousand Shamsi iqta'dars, whose grants Balban had ordered to be confiscated, claimed that they had been given those lands by Iletmish as rewards for their meritorious services; Lambton, op.cit., p.64. The author is of the opinion that personal iqta's were usually granted on a life-long or hereditary tenure, but, like other gifts, they were perhaps according to Islamic law revocable during the lifetime of the grantee; 'Ala ud-Din Khalji ordered that all villages, whether held by proprietary right, as free gifts, or as religious endowments should be brought back under the exchequer. (Barani, p.283.)

³ Barani, p.67. Prince Muhammad, the son of Balban, entreated Shaikh Uthman, a religious divine, to stay at Multan, where he offered to build
(continued on next page)

The activities of the nobles during the period 1210-1266 A.D. may be divided into two distinct phases. In the first phase 1210-1236 A.D., Iletmish by his wise administration prevented the nobles from causing political upheaval in the kingdom, but from 1236-1266, for want of an effective leader, unrestrained ambition plunged the country into utter confusion.

In the early part of the thirteenth century, the nobles who were soldiers as well as statesmen were the real backbone of the kingdom.¹ Living among an overwhelming Hindū population, they had to maintain perforce a separate existence. Their powers had begun to develop from the time of Mu'izzal-Dīn. There were efficient persons both for the administration and for the battlefield. The contemporary chronicler Hasan Nizāmi, tells us that Amīr Sābiq ul Mulk Naṣir ud-Dīn was superior to his contemporaries in the knowledge of political administration, and that his resolution and courage were celebrated throughout.

(continued from previous page)

³ a hospice for him and, also, grant villages for its maintenance, but the saint did not agree.

⁴ Afif, pp. 414, 415. When 'Ayn ul mulk was appointed governor of Multān, he requested Firūz Tughlaq to be allowed to submit his accounts to the throne and not to the Treasury.

⁵ T.N., p. 183.

¹ Barani, p. 137. In recognition of the importance of the nobles, Baranī attributes the following remarks to Iletmish: "How shall I thank God who has given me such noble courtiers, who are a thousand times better than myself. Each time in accordance with imperial custom, they pass before me and behind, and raise their hands in salutation, and stand before me in Darbār, their greatness and nobility make me ashamed of myself, and I feel like coming down from the throne to kiss their hands and feet." Tripathī, Some aspects of Muslim Administration, p. 28. Tripathī thinks that this attitude of Iletmish towards the nobles was not hypocrisy, as the position of a sovereign ruler in those days was not more than an exalted peer.

Regarding Bahā ud-Dīn Tughril, who was placed in the charge of Thangir, the same author says, that he was acquainted with both matters of administration and the art of organising an army on the battlefield.¹

'Isāmī says that Fakhr ul mulk 'Isāmī, who had held for thirty years with distinction the post of a minister at Baghdad, came and joined Iletmish's court. The king himself went some stages to receive the distinguished minister when he was approaching Delhi.²

The name of Shīr Khān Sunqur was proverbial in those days for bravery and courage. Baranī praising his valour says, "he was a highly celebrated Khān, who for thirty years after the death of Iletmish had stood like a rock against Mongol incursions."³ Muhammad Bakhtiyār Khālji was also a warrior of unshakable courage, but his last days were clouded.⁴ That there was no dearth of brave and skilled fighting men in the thirteenth century is demonstrated by the establishment of the Delhi Sultanate itself.⁵

¹ Tāj ul Ma'āthir, I.O. 1486, ff.70b, 144a.

² 'Isāmī, pp.122-123.

³ Baranī, p.65

⁴ T.N., ed. Chughtai, pp.60-9.

⁵ K.A.Nizāmī, Religion and Politics in India during the thirteenth Century, p.132, n.2. Comparing the nobles of the 13th and 18th centuries, Nizami says, "But there was a world of difference between the character and activities of the nobility during the thirteenth and eighteenth centuries. The conflict in the 13th century was due to the lack of really gifted men to shoulder the burden of the administration. In the 13th century it was the other way round. It was not the dearth of talent but its abundance which led to constant conflicts and strifes;" A.L.Basham, Politics and Society in India, p.14, says "The Turks in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries repeated on an even larger scale the feats of the Yavanas, Sakas, Kusanas and Hunas of earlier times, and drove Hindu society even further back upon itself."

Once settled as conquerors the nobles, individually and in groups, began to pull the strings of administration in the direction which served their interest most. Clash of interests among the nobles inevitably led to bitter rivalry. The reply of Mu'izz al-Dīn to a slave, that he possessed thousands of sons in his slaves who would take care of his kingdom after his death, was a clear indication of the role the slaves were to play in the newly established kingdom of India.¹ As desired by him, they soon became the be-all and end-all of his kingdom and divided the important offices among themselves. All ranks in the army, almost all key political posts, central and provincial, were firmly in their grip. The free nobility, i.e. non-Turks, were appointed in purely administrative offices, such as wazīrs, revenue officials and clerks.²

Iletmish had experienced the hostility of the Mu'izzī Amīrs at his accession and in order to avoid its repetition, he built a nucleus of his own slave-aristocracy for the preservation of his dynasty after him. These slaves he treated with great tact and wisdom. He allowed

¹ T.N., pp 131-132; Sir George Dumbarton, Bt, A history of India, p.98, where it is said, "The highest authorities in the administration were the Muhammadan holders of military fiefs."

² M. Habib, Introduction to History of India as told by its own historians, Elliot and Dowson, Vol. II, p.97.

his provincial governors independence in their internal administration but never relaxed his control over them. He treated them like bureaucratic officers, rewarding them for good services and punishing them for their faults.¹ Malik Nasir u'd-Din, the governor of Lahore, had assisted Iltutmish in 1228 A.D., in capturing Sind, Uchch and Multan which were held by Qubacha. When Iltutmish returned to the capital he rewarded Ayetmar's services by assigning to him an extensive iqta', which consisted of Siwalik, Ajmir, Lawa, Kasili and Sambal, the territories to the south of Delhi, and, also, conferred on him an elephant to distinguish him from the other nobles.²

During the Chandwar expedition, Qamr u'd-Din Qutub Tamur Khan had captured Laddah, the son of the Raja, and brought him as a captive to Iltutmish. The Sultan praised his performance, and soon

¹W.H. Moreland, The Agrarian System of Moslem India, pp 217-218; says, "Shams u'd-Din Iltutmish the second effective king of Delhi, who had himself been the property of the first king, bought foreign slaves in great numbers, employed them in his household, and promoted them according to the judgement of their capacities, to the highest positions in the kingdom." Cf. Sir G. Dunbar, op.cit. pp 100-101 who says, the Moslem rulers found these able servants excellent advisers, gave them the highest posts, and at times rewarded them by marriage with their daughters"; Cf Siyasatnama, pp 137, 131, where it is said "Whenever any servant does a praiseworthy act he should at once receive some appreciation and when one commits an offence unnecessarily and not by accident, he should be punished according to the seriousness of his transgressions, as it would make others more diligent in their work, and the guilty ones more afraid." "If a high official makes a mistake he should not be publicly censured; rather, at first his offence should be overlooked, but later, he may be called and told that his mistake has been pardoned, in order to make him more careful in future."

²T.N., pp 236, 237; Minhaj says that Saif u'd-Din Aybek on rendering approved services was gradually transferred from small iqta's to bigger ones. When he became the mugta' of Lakhnauti, he was conferred the title of Yughantat.

after made him the nā'ib-i amīr-i ākhur. When the vacancy of the amīr-i-ākhur occurred he was promoted to that post.¹

Regarding Malik Taj u'd-Dīn Sanjar Tiz Khān, a slave of Iletmish, Minhāj says, he was energetic, manly, sagacious, intelligent, and endowed with many other excellent qualities. He was also famed for his valour and military talents, and possessed an amiable disposition. Possessed of all these qualities he was not assigned any office by Iletmish. It seems he had not come up to the criterion of the king. The first office that he held was that of the amīr-i-akhur, in the reign of Mu'izz u'd-Dīn Bahram.²

The chronic delinquent Kabīr Khān was granted titles and important iqta's so long ^{as} he rendered commendable services. But when he was found guilty of some offence, which Minhāj does not disclose, Iletmish did not fail to punish him by transferring him from the administrative iqta' of Multān to the small territory of Pulwal, which was simply meant to provide him with a bare means of subsistence.³

Iletmish showed no consideration for the high social status of his compatriot 'Alā u'd-Dīn Jānī when he removed him from the governorship of Lakhnautī.⁴

¹ T.N., p.248.

² T.N., p.260.

³ Ibid, p.234; Minhāj says, "after two or four years Kabīr Khān was recalled from Multān to the capital and assigned Pulwal for his maintenance

⁴ Ibid, pp.177,239; Minhāj calls 'Alā u'd-Dīn Jānī "Shāhzādah-i-Turkestan." Cf Ahmed bin Muhammad al-Qādi, Nusakh-i Jahān-Ara, B.M.Ç.Or., 141, The author mentions 'Alā u'd-Dīn Jānī as the nephew of Iletmish. fl19a. (Biradarzādah).

Lakhnauti had been allowed some degree of independence since the days of Qutb u'd-Dīn. But when after his death, the Khaljī chiefs, one after another, repudiated Delhi's authority and assumed sovereign status, Iletmish marched against them as he would have done against the Hindu chiefs, and after defeating them in battle he showed no mercy in killing the rebel leader and his supporters.¹

As Iletmish had fully vindicated royal authority, the nobles had to turn towards him, even for small favours.²

With the death of Iletmish, respect for royal authority vanished from the hearts of the nobles. From the days of Mu'izz al-Dīn the king had controlled the nobles, but now the table was turned. Baranī alleges that the incompetent descendants of Iletmish were responsible for the situation but this is not wholly justified. The rejection of Iletmish's nomination, and the accession of Rukn u'd-Dīn, was the first blow stuck by the nobility to the authority of the Sultān,

¹ T.N., p.174; G. Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, Vol.IV, p.141, who says, in Ancient Persia, sentences of extreme rigour were passed upon rebels found to have been most in fault. The ordinary punishments were crucifixion or impalement of some sort; the least penalty being removal of the rebels en masse from their own country to some remote place.

² T.N., p.237, Saif ud-Dīn Aybek appealed to Iletmish to be allotted some other office as temperamentally he was unsuited for the post of sar-i jandar.

Since ^{then} they became supreme.¹ From now on commenced a trial of strength among the nobles themselves.

The frivolous allegations against Rukn u'd-Dīn, of squandering public money, encouraging musicians, buffoons and eunuchs, became a pretext for the governors of Badaūn, Multān, Hānsī and Lāhore, to march to Delhī in order to punish the Sultān, leaving the frontier territories exposed to foreign aggression.² As was to be expected, Hasan Qarlugh the agent of Jalāl u'd-Dīn Khwārazm Shāh at Baniyān, marched with an army to Uchch with an eye on Multān; luckily Saif u'd-Dīn Aybek the governor of Uchch proved more than a match for him.³

Even this situation could not make the governors of the frontier provinces of Lāhore and Multān return to their administrative charge. Instead, they kept on marching to Delhī with two other

¹ Sir George Dunbar, *Bt. op. cit.*, p. 101, says, "But while Iletmish was establishing his rule from the Indus to the mouths of the Ganges, a power (the Turkish slaves) was rising in his own capital which was to master his successors.", Barani, p. 28, says, "On account of the inability of the sons of Iletmish and the dominance of the Shamsi slaves the kingdom was without a ruler and everybody had become his own master."; Cf. Sir Wolseley Haig, *op. cit.* p. 62 who says, "The commanding genius of Iletmish preserved the royal dignity intact, but in the reigns of his children the power of the "Forty" was increasing."

² T.N., p. 173; Elphinstone, *History of India*, p. 376; Nusakh-i-Jahan-Ara. Or. 141, fl 17a.

³ T.N., p. 238.

governors and the wazīr Junaiddī in order to depose Raḍiyya, who had now replaced Rukn u'd-Dīn, against whom they had no ostensible cause for complaint. Raḍiyya met the situation through her sheer intelligence, and rewarded Kabīr Khān by assigning the iqṭā' of Lāhore with its dependencies for deserting his confederate and joining her.¹ This royal favour, also, could not check his restless ambition from revolting against Raḍiyya in 1240 A.D. Although he was then reduced to submission, he did not scruple to throw off Delhī's yoke and assume sovereignty in 1242 A.D., when the Mongols were battering Lāhore,² and the condition of the infant state was extremely critical.

Iletmish had been careful in preventing the nobles from developing any personal interest in the throne. This, broadly speaking, had kept his reign free from overt factionalism within the nobility, inspite of the fact that they were composed of diverse ethnical elements.³ A tendency towards factionalism among the

¹T.N.p.187; Elphinstone, op.cit., pp 375-376 who says, "of the two separate factions which had concurred in dethroning her (Raḍiyya's) brother, one was opposed to the elevation of the Sultāna. The wazīr of the last two kings was at the head of the latter faction and they were strong enough to appear before Delhī and to defeat the army that was coming to it s relief. But the queen's arts were more effective than her arms. She succeeded so well in growing dissension among her enemies that the whole confederacy dissolved and left the individuals composing it at her mercy."

²T.N., p.393.

³K.A.Nizāmī, Religion and Politics in India during the thirteenth century p.135 Nizāmī says, "Iletmish's vigilance and political adroitness, however, kept the nobles tightly under his control. His death (April 30, 1236) was a signal for the nobles to start a mad race for political power."

nobles became visible towards the close of his reign, upon the question of succession. Out of his many children, the interest of two, Rukn u'd-Dīn and Rādīya, was chiefly centred in the throne. Therefore, immediately after his death, the formation of groups with vested interest was the inevitable outcome of the struggle between the rival candidates for wearing the crown. In fact, the many children of Iletmish became excellent pretexts for the various factions to take sides with each prince and manouvere to positions of advantage.¹

The promises to individual nobles by each contestant for the throne, and, also, the preference of a noble for a particular prospect, doubtless became the basis on which the nobles organized themselves into different groups. As an evidence of this, we find that with every new ruler a new set of officials appeared.²

Minhāj says, Rukn ud-Dīn was the choice of the provincial governors and elders of the kingdom, and the people, also, had their eye

¹ Baranī, pp.132-133, Dādbak Nizām u'd-Dīn, thus expressed his fear to Sulṭān Mu'izz u'd-Dīn Kaiqubad against Kai Khusran, whom he considered a formidable competitor for kingship. "Kai Khusran is your rival in the empire, he is distinguished by kingly qualities, and there is an inclination on the part of the maliks to his side. They know he is the rightful heir to Emperor Balban, and if a few of Balban's maliks stand by him, it will not take a day to thrust you aside and place him on the throne of Delhi."

² Baranī, p.149. The author attributes these words to Bughrā Khān during his interview with Mu'izz ud-Dīn Kaiqubad, "Ever since I was informed that you were putting to death some chosen officers and faithful men of my father, which undoubtedly has alienated you from the loyalty of the rest, a picture of your destruction has been forming in my mind.", T.N., p.187; Rādīya re-organised her administrative personnel after dealing with the rebel maliks. Tarikh-i-MubarakShahi, p.71., where it is said that 'Ala u d-Dīn Khalji conferred suitable posts and titles on his supporters when he ascended the throne.

on him. The 'people' of Minhāj were probably those men of the court whom Rukn ud-Dīn had won over to his side, as he knew his father's weakness for Raḍiyya, on account of her competence. The author of Tabaqāt-i-Nāsiri does not provide the names of Rukn ud-Dīn's supporters, but it is more than probable that among others¹ there were Kabīr Khān and 'Alā ud-Dīn Jānī, the two malcontents of the reign of Iletmish, who must have thought that disregarding the late Sultān's nomination was an adequate revenge for being deprived of their administrative charges. Rukn ud-Dīn on his enthronement, assigned Multān to Kabīr Khān and Lāhore to 'Alā ud-Dīn Jānī, but this bribe did not prevent them from rising against their benefactor within six months.¹

Minhāj alleges that Raḍiyya's intimacy with the Abyssinian Jamāl ud-Dīn Yāqut had made the maliks and Turk amīrs jealous, and when she gave up the female dress and Pardah, and donned the male dress and cap, and appeared before the people who would have a good look at her when she mounted the elephant, they became more incensed.²

Minhāj's statement is questionable, as, according to Firishta, Raḍiyya had exercised royal authority in the absence of her father, when he had

¹ T.N. pp. 182-183.

² Ibid, p. 188; S.R. Sharma, The Crescent in India, p. 95; The author says that Raḍiyya's successful administration soon set up her rivals against her, especially "The Forty" who were a powerful body of Turkish slaves at the Court. 'Isāmī, pp 128-131; 'Isāmī insinuates impropriety in her behaviour with the Abyssinian Jamāl ud-Dīn yāqut.; Sir Wolseley Haig, op.cit, p. 59; He rejects the allegations against her moral character and says, "the mere advancement of an African was sufficient to excite the jealousy of the Turkish nobles."

been on the Gwāliyūr expedition.¹ Evidently, she had not discharged royal functions in the Muslim veil, nor did she screen herself from the public gaze when she pitched her pavilion on the banks of the Jumna to encounter the hostile maliks in 1236 A.D.

The real fact appears to be that Ikhtiyār ud-Dīn Aytigīn, the amīr-i hājib, could not overshadow the Abyssinian amīr-i ākhur, and that Rāḍiyya refused to yield to any pressure of the amīr-i hājib, which became her real offence. By wearing the male dress she meant to give weight to the kingly responsibilities which she had been discharging. In trying to assert royal authority, she lost the throne and, also, her life.

The accession of Mu'izz ud-Dīn Bahram was a triumph for Ikhtiyār ud-Dīn's faction, as the new Sultān agreed to remain a shadow figure, allowing the nobles to exercise sovereign power at least for a year.² But the success was short-lived. Ikhtiyār ud-Dīn, who had become the na'ib-i mulk and Muha dh dhab ud-Dīn the wazīr, were now the chief pillars of the administration, and were attacked by assassins at the White Palace after a religious discourse. The former at once succumbed to his injuries, but the latter escaped with two wounds.³

¹ Tārīkh-i Firishta, p.118, Vol. I.

² S.M. Ikram, History of Muslim Civilization, p.161, According to Ikram, this experiment did not basically differ from the contemporary attempts of the English barons, which contained immense possibilities of constitution^{al} progress. In Delhi it proved a failure for which the na'ib-i mulk, nominated by the nobles was solely responsible; T.N., pp 192, 253.

³ T.N. p.254; T.A., Vol. I, p.68.

That the king was not the sole author of the assassination plot, and that there were other powerful hands behind it, may be gathered from a passage of the Tabaqāt-i Nāsiri¹, and also from the fact that there was no protest when the leader of the powerful faction that had overthrown Rādīya had been assassinated.

After the murder of Aytigīn, his two supporters, 'Izz ud-Dīn Sālārī, and the vacillating Qarāqash, the governor of Lāhore, returned from the Court and joined Altūniya, who had by now married Rādīya and was marching with an army to Delhī to wrest the throne from Mu'izz ud-Dīn Bahram. How Qarāqash after the defeat and death of his confederates, Altūniya and Rādīya, still retained the governorship of Lāhore is not known.² His performance at Lāhore was far from satisfactory. There he not only failed to win the confidence of the people, but also acted in a craven-hearted manner by stealthily leaving the city at night when the Mongols attacked it in December 1241 A.D. As a result, first the Mongols and then the Hindūs subjected the defenceless city to thorough devastation.³

¹ T.N., p.254; Minhāj thus describes the assassination of Aytigīn: After the religious discourse, Sipah Sālār Ahmed Sa'id came secretly to the Sultān and made some representation; upon which intoxicating drinks were given to several Turks, who on becoming intoxicated came down from the Qasr-i-safed (White Palace) at the direction of the king and stabbed Ikhtiyār ud-Dīn Aytigīn to death.

² T.A., Vol.I, p.68; where it is said that Malik Tigīn on both occasions marched against Rādīya and defeated her; T.N., pp.190,255; Minhāj mentions only one encounter with Rādīya, when Badr ud-Dīn Sunqur, the amir-i hajib performed distinguished services; 'Isāmī, pp.134-6; says that on both occasions Bahram entrusted the command of the army to Balban-i khurd (Junior Balban); Minhāj clearly says that the king led the army, and is undoubtedly a more reliable authority as he was an eye-witness to it.

³ T.N., pp.393-5; Minhāj says that the Mongols used catapults to destroy Lahore.

Ikhtiyār ud-Dīn's successor, Badr ud-Dīn Sunqur, on being appointed amīr-i ḥājib adopted a dictatorial attitude. He ignored both the wazīr and the Sultān and issued his own orders. He even conspired to dethrone Mu'izz ud-Dīn, and place a brother of the latter on the throne. But he could not play the game with skill and perfection, as he confided his plan to wazīr Muhadhhab ud-Dīn who was a camp follower of the late Aytigīn, and to whom he had also given good cause to be his sworn enemy. The wazīr disclosed the whole plot to the Sultān through an agent. Bahrām himself raided the scene of the conspiracy and discovered Sunqur hatching the plot. It cost Sunqur, first his office and afterwards his life. Jalālud-Dīn Musāwī, his accomplice, in the conspiracy, also, shared the same fate.¹

Bahrām had so far played his trump cards successfully. But when the Mongols advanced on Lāhore in 1241 A.D. and the city was left defenceless by its governor, Bahrām despatched an army from the capital against the Mongols, entrusting the charge to Qutb ud-Dīn Hussain, along with the wazīr and other maliks and amīrs.²

After the incident of Sunqur it seems the Sultān had begun to consider Muhadhhab ud-Dīn his well-wisher. But the wazīr was hardly sincere, as he nursed a grudge since the day he was stabbed. In order to have his revenge on the Sultān, he sent a note to him from

¹T.N., pp.193-4.

²Ibid., p.195.

the bank of the Beās asking for an edict to destroy the amīrs and Turks who would never become obedient. Minhāj says that Mu'izzud-Dīn, in haste and out of childishness, despatched the desired order, which, as was expected, the wazīr showed to the amīrs and Turks.

The army officers, instead of being frightened, considered revenge on the king as their prime concern. Leaving Lāhore to its fate, they returned to the capital. Lāhore was devastated but Muhadh^{ab}dhⁿud-Dīn gained his satisfaction in that he had outwitted and avenged the Sultān.¹

After the capture of Mu'izz ud-Dīn, the nobles who had become masters of the destiny of Iletmish's descendants, according to Minhāj, consented to bring out from confinement three princes, 'Alā ud-Dīn Mas'ūd, Jalāl ud-Dīn and Nāṣir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd.²

They chose 'Alā ud-Dīn Mas'ūd, the son of Rukn ud-Dīn Fīrūz, as king, in preference to the sons of Iletmish. The appointment of Quṭb ud-Dīn Hussain of Ghor as the nā'ib-i mulk of the new king indicates that Muhadh^{ab}dhⁿud-Dīn had consolidated his authority as wazīr, with the support of the non-Turks. To have a firm grip on the

¹ T.A., Vol. I, p. 70, where it is said that the wazīr, out of treachery and deceit wrote to the Sultān, "Nothing could be achieved from the body of treacherous men sent with him and that the disturbance would not be quelled unless the Sultān should himself march to that part of the country."; T.N., pp. 196-7, Minhāj says, "be ishārat-i Khwaja Muhadh^{ab}dhⁿud-Dīn bar ikhrāj wa 'azl-i Sultān bay'at kardand" (On the instigation of Khwaja Muhadh^{ab}dhⁿud-Dīn they pledged to expel and punish the Sultān); Tarikh-i Mubarak Shahi, p. 31.

² T.N., p. 197.

administration, elimination of the Turks from key posts was the natural course of his policy. But it seems he acted in a tactless manner which offended the general body of Turks and ended in his murder.¹

It appears that Qarāqash Khān and Ikhtiyār ud-Dīn Yuzbak Tughril Khān resorted to treachery to bring about Mu'izz ud-Dīn's destruction. They were evidently suspected as such by Mu'izz ud-Dīn and his faithful adviser, Mubārak Shāh Furrukhī, the farrash, for when they came to offer their aid to the king against the maliks and amīrs who had besieged Delhī, they were cast into prison. That the suspicion was not ill-founded is confirmed by the appointment of Qarāqash as the amīr-i hājib in the reign of Mu'izz ud-Dīn's successor.²

Minhāj does not mention why Qarāqash within six months was removed from the post of amīr-i hājib, and transferred first to the iqṭā' of Bayāna and later to Kara. That a new faction was on the way to seizing power in the administration is indicated by the removal of Qarāqash and the murder of Muhadhhab ud-Dīn.

Balban, who succeeded Qarāqash in the post of amīr-i hājib was the leader of the new faction.³ In order to assert its authority this faction employed every means to remove its former rivals. Minhāj has tried to obscure certain facts of the reign of 'Alā ud-Dīn Mas'ūd

¹ T.N., p.198. Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī, p.33, says, "Muhadh^{dh}hab ud-Dīn took all functions out of the hands of the Turks and brought them under his authority.

² T.N., p.250.

³ Ibid., p.287.

as it would expose his patron, Balban. Nevertheless, his statement and that of 'Isāmī help to reveal to a large extent the real picture. According to Minhāj, "A number of characterless persons belonging to the army had clandestinely gained access to Sultān 'Alā ud-Dīn and they used to influence him in the commission of unworthy acts and habits, to the extent that the practice of seizing and killing his maliks acquired a place in his nature."¹ It is surprising that the energetic king who had expelled the mongols from the western frontier, overnight became an addict to these practices. Minhāj does not like to say that Balban, in order to seize complete authority began to eliminate and kill his political adversaries. The young Mas'ūd, as a dispenser of justice, resented his activities and it seems, also, punished with death some members of the powerful faction, who were found guilty of high-handedness. In all probability these were the 'Maliks' referred to by Minhāj, whom Mas'ūd began to 'seize and kill'. That the Sultān had realised the consequences of his action, for which he kept himself always alert, is indicated by 'Isāmī. He says "for two or three weeks the nobles were seeking the opportunity to seize him, until one day when he was off guard, they captured him."²

¹ T.N., pp.200-1; Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī, p.34. Yahya, without quoting his authority, tries to improve on the information given by Minhāj. He makes the amusing statement that 'Alā ud-Dīn Mas'ūd during his operation against the Mongols, suddenly came under the influence of 'Abyssinians' and low-born persons, who instigated him to commit unworthy acts; Raidat us safa, Vol.IV, f.522b. Mīrkhwand, calls Mas'ūd a generous ruler of good behaviour and pious character.

² 'Isāmī, p.139; Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī, p.34. Yahya says that "On Sunday June 10, 1246 A.D., Mas'ūd was seized and cast into prison." T.N., p.201. Minhāj simply says that Mas'ūd was imprisoned on Sunday, June 10, 1246 A.D.

The dethronement of Mas'ūd and the accession of Nāsir ud-Dīn Mahmūd was the successful conclusion of the conspiracy of Balban and his followers.

Ikrām calls the reign of Mahmūd as the 'Era of Balban'.¹ Habībullāh is of the opinion that Balban was in firm control of the affairs of the kingdom during Mahmūd's reign.² Baranī says that Balban ruled while Mahmūd was a mere namīna (puppet).³ Balban's authority had immensely increased after the murder of Wazīr Muhadhhab-ud-Dīn. The appointment of Najm ud-Dīn Abū Bakr as the wazīr in the reign of Mas'ūd is the first evidence in this respect. When Balban was removed from the post of nā'ib-i mulk in 1253 A.D. Najm ud-Dīn, being considered his partisan, was also deprived of his office.⁴

Nāsir ud-Dīn Mahmūd was completely eclipsed by Balban and his faction. It was probably the condition of his accession. The complete domination of a group of nobles over the ruler encouraged others and undermined the authority of the crown. That the youthful king was not lacking in energy and daring is evident from the interest he evinced in personally conducting various campaigns.⁵

¹ S.M. Ikrām, History of Muslim Civilization, p.63.

² Habībullāh, Foundation of Muslim Rule in India, p.125.

³ Baranī, p.26. Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī, p.40. Yahya informs us that when Balban was a Khān the reigns of sovereignty were in his hands.

⁴ T.N., p.217.

⁵ Ikrām, History of Muslim Civilization, p.62; Referring to the accession of Nāsir ud-Dīn, Mahmūd, Ikrām says, "after receiving many assurances the nobles among whom Balban played a dominant role, enthroned Iltutmish's youngest son, Nāsir ud-Dīn Mahmūd; Cf. P.Saran, Studies in Medieval history, p.235; says, "The Turkish maliks (continued on next page...)"

"Izz ud-Dīn Balban Kashlū Khān, in recognition of his valiant assistance against the Mongols in 1246 A.D. had been assigned by Mas'ūd the territory of Multān. After the murder of Mas'ūd, he requested Nāsir ud-Dīn Mahmūd to be given the territory of Uchch, in addition to Multān. The king agreed on the condition that he gave up his previous iqtā's of Nāgor and the Siwālik territories. But 'Izz ud-Dīn Balban, who was a powerful noble and had led the uprisings against Rukn ud-Dīn Fīrūz and Mu'izz ud-Dīn Bahrām, was reluctant to abide by the condition. The Sultān had to march his troops to implement his order, and according to Minhāj, 'Izz ud-Dīn agreed to relinquish his former assignments after much protraction and difficulty.¹

'Izz ud-Dīn Balban soon lost Multān to Hasan Qarlugh and Uchch to Shīr Khān; on returning to the court he was assigned Badaūn, with its dependencies. When Shīr Khān turned refractory to the royal authority and visited the court of Mangu Khān in Turkestan, 'Izz ud-Dīn was given Uchch and Multān, but it did not help to restore his shattered relations with the sovereign of Delhī, as he probably suspected that the occupation of his territory by Shīr Khān was planned by the Delhī court. Immediately afterwards,

(Continued from previous page)

⁵ led by Balban decided to pull down Mas'ūd and invited Mahmūd from Bahraich to occupy the throne because they expected that he would prove a 'good boy' and would let Balban be the virtual ruler."; Cf. T.N., p.209; Cf. Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī, pp.35-8.

² T.N., pp.269-70.

he made overtures to Hulāgū, who was then in 'Irāq, for sending an Intendant. He even sent his son to the Mongol Court as a pledge of his loyalty. In alliance with QutlughKKhān, the step-father of Nāsir ud-Dīn Mahmūd. he made a second attempt to seize the throne in 1258 A.D.; this time by appeal to arms.¹

'Izz ud-Dīn and Qutlugh failed in their attempt on account of the timely defence arrangements by the ruler. 'Izz ud-Dīn returned to Uchch, from where he proceeded to the court of Hulāgū in 'Irāq to seek consolation for his disappointment. Regardless of the consequences to the infant Muslim kingdom, he even brought a Mongol army to Sind with aggressive intentions.² The Mongol army, however, withdrew leaving behind an Intendant.

In the reign of Mahmūd every noble attempted to become more and more powerful, either at the expense of the ruler or another noble. In such a contest Rayhān succeeded in overthrowing Balban, but as he lacked the tact to rally around him those Turkish nobles who had become disaffected towards his opponent, and also because he did not clear the court of the supporters of Balban, he could not enjoy the fruits of his success. Very soon Najm ud-Dīn Abū Bakr and Minhāj were again appointed wazīr and qādī respectively. That both these supporters got back their posts before their patron Balban was reinstated

¹T.N., pp.271-2.

²Ibid., p.273.

indicates that there had been internal pressure on the Sultān.¹
The confusion was complete when, for the sake of Balban, his supporters were even prepared to take up arms against the ruler. Those nobles who did not have the resources to match the crown, either took shelter with Hindū chiefs, whose doors, according to Minhāj, were always open, or applied to the Mongol court for help.²

¹T.N., pp.218-9.

²Ibid., pp.306, 271-2.

CHAPTER FIVE

The Nobles and the Succession of the Sultān

As the state was not the private property of an individual or of a family or group of families, there were therefore no established rules in Islam which could govern the procedure of succession of a state-chief.¹ Islamic political theory recognizes the Muslim community² as the Supreme body, which alone is authorised to organise the political and administrative functions of the state, and to elect the most competent person as its leader.³

The elected leader should be invested with authority for discharging governmental obligations on behalf of the community, and should receive acknowledgement, so long as he is virtuous, God-fearing and follows the right path. If he transgresses he should not be allowed to retain his leadership.⁴

¹ Qur'ān, 42.38; It says, Muslims should settle their affairs by mutual consultation; David De Santillana, 'Law and Society', Legacy of Islam, p.286, who says, 'In a Muslim state, sovereignty essentially belonged to God - "the public treasury is the treasury of Allāh, the army is the army of Allāh, even the public functionaries are the employees of Allāh."

² Qur'ān, 9.1 says "And certainly we have given you power on Earth, and created in it means of livelihood for you."

³ R. Levy, The Social Structure of Islām, p.287, n.1, says that according to Shirāzī, Tanbih, p.311, 'the election of an Imām is a duty incumbent on the whole community. If there is only one man suitable for it he must seek the office. If he refuses, he must be compelled to take it; al-Māwardī, Ahkām us Sultāniya, Urdu translation by sayyid Muḥammad Ibrāhīm, p.12, who says, the Imamate concerns two groups - those vested with power to elect the Imām, and the group from whom the Imām is to be elected. This of course is applicable when competent persons decline to accept the office.

⁴ Qur'ān, 18.4; T.N., p.223. The turban-wearers ('ulemā) and the citizens of Delhi attempted to depose Nāṣir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd; al-Māwardī, op.cit. p.35.

The leader and the people become bound to one another by a ceremony called bay'at.¹ The recognition of the community as the supreme political authority, explains the absence of the concept of kingship and hereditary rule in the early days of Islām.

The first Caliph of Islām, Abū Bakr was elected by a consensus of Muslim opinion. Since that time it became for the Muslim world an important precedent and an accepted principle, in the election of their future leaders.²

The succession of the second Caliph, 'Umar, did not take place on the same principle. He was nominated by Abu Bakr himself because of his ability.³ The first Caliph however did not fail to give his nomination the shape of a general election by securing the consent of the highly important Ansār and Muhājirīn. His strongest point in favour of his choice was the fact that 'Umar was no relation of his.⁴

¹ Ibn Khaldūn, Muqaddimah, Urdu Trans. by S.H. Khān Yūsufī, p.239. Bay'at is an oath of allegiance by the people to the supreme temporal power; but at the same time the oath of allegiance imposed an obligation on the sovereign to see that the 'Laws of God' were obeyed; T.W.Arnold, The Caliphate, pp.31-4, 72; David De Santillana, 'Law and Society', Legacy of Islam, pp.297-8.

² Von Kremer, Culturgeschichte des Orients, translated by Khudā Bakhsh, as Orient under the Caliphs, p.9; al-Mawardi, op.cit., p.14, where it is said, Initially five persons offered their allegiance to Abū Bakr, and this was followed by the community.

³ Sir W. Muir, The Caliphate, p.77, quotes Abū Bakr, "I swear that when I meet my Lord, I will say unto Him, I have appointed as ruler of Thy people him that is best among them."

⁴ Ibn Khaldūn, Eng. Trans. by F. Rosenthal, Vol.I, p.430, where it is said "(the Caliph) is the guardian and trustee of the (Muslims). He looks after their affairs as long as he lives. It follows that he should look after their affairs after his death, and therefore should appoint someone to take charge of their affairs."

('None of mine own kin'.)

'Umar on his death-bed asked 'Abd al-Rahmān to succeed him, but when the latter declined to accept the burden of responsibility, he appointed a council of regency to elect his successor. The conclave consisted of 'Abd al-Rahmān, 'Alī, Uthmān, Zubayr, and Sa'd; Talha was to be included if he returned within three days from Medina.¹ He instructed his son 'Abd-Allāh to vote with the majority in the first instance, but in the event of an equal vote he should support the candidate for whom 'Abd al-Rahmān had voted. His words clearly brought out the points that a restricted selection conducted by the leading elements of the community was valid to elect the head of a state; and that his son had no place in the succession, as an Islamic state was not a hereditary monarchy.

Mu'āwiya was the first Caliph to have laid the foundation of a hereditary rule. Although he appointed his son Yazid as his successor, he could not ignore the impact of public opinion, and therefore sought the support of the leading men for his nomination. His daring innovation changed the republican character of the Islamic caliphate into a monarchy.² Habīb says, "thereafter it became an unwritten

¹ Sir W. Muir, The Caliphate, pp. 78, 188.

² R. Levy, The Social Structure of Islām, p. 280; quotes the reply of 'Abd-Allah, son of the Caliph 'Umar to Mu'āwiya, from Tabarī, Annales, Vol. II, f. 176. "And by Allah, if the community agrees together after you are dead upon a (black) Abyssinian slave, I will follow the course set by it."; Sir W. Muir, The Caliphate, pp. 189, 302.

law that the Caliphs, and following them the Sultans of later days, had the authority to nominate their successors from among their sons and brothers, and that the nomination would become valid when accepted by the leading officers of the State."¹ Thus the theories evolved that the executive head of a state could be installed by the consent of the majority, or by the nomination of the leading men of the community, or by being a descendant of the deceased ruler. Subsequently a school of jurists developed a constitutional theory which recognized monarchy as an inevitable institution. Von Kremer says, the Arab thinkers considered kingship absolutely essential for the maintenance of social order.²

Over the question of succession, therefore, Islām's attitude was flexible. In India, also, on the issue of the succession of rulers the Turks tried to follow the traditions that had been crystallized by

¹ M. Habīb, 'Introduction', Elliot and Dowson, History of India as told by its own historians, Vol. II, p. 6 (ed. 1952); Sir W. Muir, The Caliphate, p. 303, says, "Mu'awiya's action becomes the received precedent of Islām." Ibn Khaldūn (Rosenthal), op. cit., p. 431, says, "No suspicion of the Imam is justified if he appoints his father or his son as his successor ... especially if there exists some reason for the appointment of a successor, such as desire to promote public interest, or fear that some harm might arise if no successor were appointed, suspicion of the Imam is out of question. This was the case with Mu'awiya's appointment of his son Yazīd."

² Nizāmī 'Arudī Chahār Maqāla, Eng. trans. by E. G. Browne, p. 11, writes, "The Imam must have vicars to act in different parts of the world, and not everyone of these shall have such powers that all mankind shall be compelled to acknowledge it. Hence there must be an administrator or compeller, who is called monarch or king and his vicarious function 'Sovereignty'; Ibn Khaldūn (Rosenthal), op. cit., pp. 91-3; "When mankind has achieved social organisation - and when civilisation in the world has thus become a fact, people need someone to exercise a restraining influence and keep them apart, for injustice and aggressiveness are in the animal nature of man. The person who exercises a restraining influence, therefore, must be one of themselves. He must dominate them and have power and authority over them, so that no-one of them will be able to attack another." Tārīkh-i Fakhṛ ud-Dīn Mubārak Shah, pp. 12-13; Orient under the Caliphs, p. 25.

Islām. Being the senior members of the Muḥammadan community in India, they considered the right to select kings as their special prerogative.

When Ghiyāth ud-Dīn Muḥammad died in 1203 A.D., the people and the nobles of Ghor acquiesced in the succession of his brother Mu'izz al-Dīn, as he was the most senior and also the most competent member of the royal family; Ghiyāth ud-Dīn Maḥmūd, the son of the deceased Sultān, finding that the people had tacitly agreed to his uncle's accession, also, submitted to the fait accompli.¹

Minhāj would have us believe that Mu'izz al-Dīn had given Tāj ud-Dīn Yalduz a black banner because he intended him to be his successor at Ghazna. But the nobles of Ghazna considered that electing the ruler was their privilege. As, in their opinion, after the assassination of Mu'izz al-Dīn at Damyak in 1206 A.D., Ghiyāth ud-Dīn Maḥmūd was the rightful heir, being a member of the royal family, they invited him to come from the environs of Garmsīr and ascend the throne.²

It is not to be doubted that the mutual jealousy of the nobles had, also, played a strong part in the invitation. Hence, in the first instance, they ignored one of their numbers, and attempted to have a member of the ruling dynasty as the king. The words of Minhāj give a

¹T.N., pp.7,121. Minhāj says that the nobles set aside Amīr Parī from the throne of Ghazna and placed Sebuktigīn on it, as he had proved his ability by defeating the combined force of Abū 'Alī Anuk and the Prince of Kābul. al-Māwardī, op.cit., p.16, says, "when the people accept someone whom they like as their Imām, the decision is irrevocable."

²T.N., p.133; 'Darkhātīrash ān būd ki wali-'ahd-i Ghaznī... b'ad az Sultān u bashad.' He (Mu'izzal-Dīn) had in his mind that after him, he (Tāj ud-Dīn Yalduz) should succeed at Ghazna.

clue to the sentiments of the nobles who were unwilling to recognize anyone else except Ghiyath ud-Dīn Mahmūd for rulership.¹ Only when the faint hearted nephew of Mu'izz al-Dīn showed his disinclination to shoulder the responsibilities of kingship did the nobles accept the supremacy of another noble.

Qutb ud-Dīn had to go through the ordeal of convincing the nobles, and it took him three months to ascend the throne at Lāhore.² The Taj ul Ma'athir informs us that Qutb ud-Dīn took over the administration of the Indian portion of his deceased master's kingdom, upon which the nobles and the dependants of the court offered their allegiance to him. The expression of loyalty by the nobility was an instrument of ratification of Qutb ud-Dīn's sovereignty.³

With the death of Qutb ud-Dīn, factions formed among the nobles. Minhāj mentions that after the sudden death of Aybek, the nobles and princes of Hindustān, for the contentment of the army and peace and tranquillity of the people and country, thought it advisable to place

¹ T.N., p.133; "Mulūk wa umarā yi Turk-rā khātir wa mizāf an būd ki Sultān Ghiyath ud-Dīn Mahmūd Sam az hudud-i Garmsir bi tarf-i Ghaznin ayed wa bar takht-i-'am-i-khud nashinad." So they wrote to him 'Wārith-i mulk tu-i wa mā bandagan -i tu.' (The maliks and Turkish amirs had the intention and sentiment that Sultān Ghiyath ud-Dīn, Mahmūd Sam should come from the region of Garmsir to Ghazna and ascend the throne of his uncle. You are the heir to the throne and we are your slaves); Sir Percy Sykes, History of Persia, Vol.I, p.489; where it is said, When the soldiers killed the usurper Shahr Baraz in 629 A.D., they carried his corpse through the streets of the capital crying out 'Whoever not being of the blood-royal seats himself on the throne of Persia will share the fate of Shahr Baraz'; G.Rawlinson, The Seventh Great Oriental Monarchies, p.543.

² Tarikh-i Mubarak Shahi, pp.12,14; T.N. (ed. Chughtai,) p.54.

³ Taj ul Ma'athir, I.O.1486; f.202a; R.Levy, op.cit., p.286. He says, when persons having power to 'bind and loosen' (i.e. the 'Ulema) acknowledge a person as 'Imam, the acknowledgement confirms the office in his hands; T.N., p.140.

Ārām Shāh on the throne.¹ The accession was a direct challenge to the importance of Delhi, which had occupied a central position during Qutb ud-Dīn's conquest. The Delhi nobles could not be expected to accept a secondary position by recognizing a ruler who had been nominated by the Lāhore barons. They therefore, without considering the fact that Ārām Shāh was Qutb ud-Dīn's son, implored Iletmish to come from Badāun and ascend the throne at Delhi.²

The accession of Iletmish was soon challenged by the Mu'izzī Amīrs, which led to a full scale battle between them and the Sultān. It was the Delhi faction which emerged triumphant. From now on, the nobles claimed undisputed right to nominate a successor to the throne.³

Thereafter until the accession of Nāsir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd, 1246 A.D. the ruler of Delhi was always a creation of the nobles. Their monopoly was broken by Balban, but it reappeared immediately after his death. The motive force in placing a king on the throne was the self-interest of the various groups of nobles. Whenever a group acquired strength it made a demonstration of it, by pulling down a reigning king and

¹ Dr K. S. Lal, 'Succession to the Sultanate of Delhi', Journal of Indian History, Vol. XXX, parts 1-3 (88-90), p. 148. Dr Lal says that Ārām was too young for the throne and this went against him'; but quotes no authority for his statement.

² T.N., p. 170; Isāmī, pp. 102-3. The author conveys the impression that after Qutb ud-Dīn's death, Ārām Shāh and Iletmish ruled simultaneously at Lāhore and Delhi respectively; R. Levy, op. cit., p. 287; where it is said "Two Imāms cannot exist in the community at one and the same time." Mir Khwand, Raḥdat us safa, Vol. IV, f. 521a, says when the nobles and important men of the kingdom found Ārām Shāh incompetent, they invited Iletmish to occupy the throne, - which according to the contemporary chronicler is not a correct statement.

³ T.N., p. 170, Minhāj says, 'Many of the Mu'izzī chiefs were brought under the sword, Taj ul Ma'athir, I.O. 1486, ff. 214b-216b. Hasan Nizāmī says that two of the rebel leaders, Aq Sunqur and Furrakh Shāh were slain, while Sar-i Jāndār Teerakī took to flight. Many others were also put to the sword.

installing its own candidate. Iletmish, while nominating his daughter Radiya as his successor, forgot that she was encroaching on the dearly cherished right of the nobles to elect the Sultān. The nobles could not remain silent spectators to the violation of their authority, so they protested against the nomination and demanded a convincing explanation for his choice.¹ Without taking the protest as a warning, Iletmish had his nomination proclaimed, which after his death became the cause of his dynasty's destruction.

No sooner had he died than the maliks and elders of the kingdom who were present during his illness, ignored the nomination² of their dead king and raised to the throne their own nominee, Rukn ud-Din Firuz.

Radiya's intelligence soon discovered the weight of the nobles in the matter of succession. It appears that during the short rule of Rukn ud-Din she had played her cards well in widening the breach between the court nobles and the governors of the provinces. It was

(continued from previous page)

³ H. Nelson Wright, Coinage and Metrology of the Sultāns of Delhi, p.71; explains that the inscription Qutbi on Iletmish's coinage is suggestive of of his early conflict with the Mu'izzi Amirs.

¹ T.N., p.185; Minhāj says, "At the time of the proclamation of (Radiya's) nomination some of the servants of the court who were close to him (Iletmish) asked the wisdom in nominating a daughter when he had grown up sons". T.A., Vol.I, p.65.

² Sir Wolseley Haig, op.cit., p.33, writes, "Mas'ūd aged three, the son of Maudud, was nominated heir by his father according to a will. The servants of the household proclaimed him Amīr, but the nobles of Ghazna who had not been consulted refused to ratify this arrangement and on December 29, 1049, A.D. deposed the child and proclaimed his uncle, 'Alī Abul Ḥasan." Maudūd had died of intestinal complaint on 22 December 1049 A.D.; 'Isāmī, p.124. 'Isāmī does not mention that Radiya had been nominated as the successor. He however describes the concern of the nobles for choosing an heir to the throne after the death of Iletmish. The faction among others consisted of Balban-i buzurg and Balban-i khurd.

found that when she made her final appeal for the crown to the court nobles, on whom she must have clearly impressed that they had as much a right to award the throne as the provincial governors, the guards and Turkish nobles of the court presented her the throne, despite the fact that Rukn ud-Dīn was still alive and was, also, wearing the crown.¹ Where Iletmish's nomination had failed, the consent of a group of nobles prevailed.

The enthronement of Radiya was an adjustment of convenience by a group of nobles who were coming into prominence, and appeared to be prepared for an open conflict with the faction that had placed Rukn ud-Dīn on the throne. On the issue of Radiya's accession the rival groups, each concerned to safeguard its own interest, did not take long to clash among themselves. The governors who had been marching to Delhi to depose Rukn ud-Dīn refused to accept Radiya's enthronement, and attempted to pull her down by force. Their plan could not succeed as the nobles who had supported Radiya's cause, resisted the pressure successfully.²

¹T.N., p.184; Minhāj says, "the afwāi-i galb and Turkish amirs, having returned to the capital attached themselves to Sultan Radiya and offered their bay'at to her and placed her on the throne." R.P.Tripathi, Some aspects of Muslim Administration, p.28. He says, as fitness to rule was a decisive qualification with Iletmish and the Turkish commanders, the high officials became silenced when Iletmish told that Radiya was the fittest of his descendants to rule. It may be noted that Radiya was never given the throne after the death of Iletmish. In fact, a strong ruler was never liked as may be seen in the case of Ala ud-Din-Masūd; Isāmī, pp.126-7, says, the arkān-i daulat (Elders of the court), who were seriously concerned to find a successor, agreed to place Radiya on the throne.

²T.N., p.186.

The faction that now emerged powerful in the Court was led by Ikhtiyār ud-Dīn Aytigīn. He found in Rāḍiyya an ambitious ruler and one unresponsive to his dictates. As the nobles wanted a pliant and weak ruler, she was subjected to baseless charges which only expose the incensed atmosphere of the court against her, rather than her own personal guilt.¹

The next ruler, Mu'izz ud-Dīn Bahrām, was raised to the throne by the nobles after the imprisonment of Rāḍiyya at Bhatinda.² Describing the qualities of Bahrām, Minhāj says, "he was unassuming and frank, never wore jewellery and finery like other kings, nor showed any desire for girdles, silken garments, decoration, banners or display."³

Bahrām's simplicity led Ikhtiyār ud-Dīn's faction to believe that he would prove a submissive ruler, for which he came to be selected. As it was the condition of his enthronement, the king

¹Tripathī, *op.cit.*, p.30. Tripathī says that the Turkish nobles wanted a vigorous king who could rule with strength and also be amenable to the general wishes of the peers; M.Habib, *op.cit.*, p.96; Habib analyses the motive of the nobles in enthroning a monarch, as follows: "In practise the leading chiefs through force or intrigue combined to instal or dethrone a monarch. Very often their attempt was to put the crown into commission - to have a dummy king and to do everything in his name."; 'Isāmi, p.133. As mouth-piece of Rāḍiyya, 'Isāmi has rightly mentioned the cause of the hostility of the nobles towards Rāḍiyya; Be-wahshat zi mam bandagān-i pidār-Rubudand Taj-i Kayanī zi sar. (Being frightened of me (i.e. my strong administration) the slaves of my father, have snatched away the Kayanī (a ruler of Persia) crown from my head.)

²'Isāmi, p.130 says, after Yāqūt was murdered at the court, Rāḍiyya was imprisoned and sent to Bhatinda; T.N.pp.188-9; Minhāj says, Yāqūt was killed at Bhatinda by the Turk amirs and Rāḍiyya was also seized and imprisoned there. Minhāj being present on the occasion, is a better authority than 'Isāmi for such details.

³T.N. pp.190-1, Minhāj calls Bahrām also a 'murderer and a tyrant' but there is little doubt that circumstances forced him to adopt this role after he had become king.

delegated the powers of a de facto ruler to his nā'ib-i mulk, Ikhtiyār ud-Dīn Aytigīn. Subsequent developments show that Bahram could not reconcile himself to the position of a puppet. The Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī tells us that the nā'ib-i mulk overstepped his limit, which produced a great dislike in the mind of the Sultān. The result was that the king entered into a conspiracy with the nobles belonging to the opposite camp, and had him assassinated.

Badr ud-Dīn Sunqur the new amīr-i hājib, who stepped in the place of the deceased nā'ib-i mulk, belonged to a different faction. He vigorously disagreed with the Wazīr Muhadhhab ud-Dīn who belonged to the former faction, and even reduced him to the position of a nonentity by usurping his powers.² That Badr ud-Dīn Sunqur's faction had plotted the murder of Aytigīn and Muhadhhab ud-Dīn is a probable assumption. Bahram's wisdom in retaining elements of diverse factions in his administration in order to maintain a balance of power in the court soon made him unpopular with the amīr-i hājib. As was natural, the amīr-i hājib hatched a conspiracy to dethrone the king, and have a more yielding ruler.³ The attempt to include Muhadhhab ud-Dīn in the intrigue was Sunqur's fatal blunder. The wazīr exposed the machination to the king through an agent, and succeeded in bringing about Sunqur's destruction.⁴

¹ Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī, p.28.

² T.N., pp.192-3.

³ 'Isāmī, p.132. A graphic description of the discussion of the nobles for deposing Bahram and electing a new ruler is presented by the author.

⁴ T.N., (ed. chughtāi), pp.103,156.

The death of Sunqur marked the temporary collapse of his faction, as most members of his party became scattered; the wazīr once again strengthened his position with the support of the non-Turkish elements in the court.

When Mu'izz ud-Dīn Bahram was deposed, an ambitious noble, 'Izz ud-Dīn Balbān Kashkū Khān, proclaimed himself king, but the amīrs and maliks who considered themselves the sole authority to elect rulers repudiated his pretensions. Some of them even went to the tomb of Iletmish, perhaps to re-affirm their oath of fidelity to his dynasty. 'Izz ud-Dīn Balban realised that without the support of the nobles he would not be able to remain on the throne, as such, he accepted the accession of 'Alā ud-Dīn Masūd, son of Rukn ud-Dīn Firūz, whom the dominant group had chosen in preference to the living sons of Iletmish.¹

The appointment of Qutb ud-Dīn Hussain of Ghor as 'Alā ud Dīn's nā'ib-i mulk, indicates that the new king was the choice of Muhaddhab ud-Dīn's faction, which included the non-Turks. The reaction of the Turks to the supremacy of the non-Turks was inevitable. The first casualty was the non-Turk wazīr, Muhaddhab ud-Dīn, as he had, according to Minhāj, wrested all authority from the Turks and concentrated them in his own hands. Muhaddhab ud-Dīn's death opened the

¹ T.N., p.197; Tripathī, op.cit., p.29, says, "another significant fact is the history of the so-called slaves was the unanimous recognition by the nobles of the right of the descendants of Iletmish to reign. P Cf. R. Levy, op.cit., p.283; speaking about the 'Abbāsid monarchs from the third century onwards, he says, "The 'Commander of the Faithful' was then elected or deposed according to the whim of the Turkish amir ul umarā, or Supreme Commander, who happened to be in power, though he was always chosen from the 'Abbāsid family."

path for Balban's rise to power who had undoubtedly exploited the sentiments of the Turks in their racial interest.

For exercising effective authority a new group coming into power required a new ruler. 'Alā ud-Dīn had to pay with his life for Balban's ascendancy. His destruction was accelerated on account of his disapproval of Balban's vindictive policy. 'Isāmī clearly states that it was Mas'ūd's independent attitude which made the nobles (Balban's faction) hostile to him.¹

Even before Mas'ūd's dethronement, the nobles had selected his successor and clandestinely brought him from Bahraich to Delhi. Minhāj says, "the amirs and maliks agreed together and despatched letters secretly to Sultān Nāsir ud-Dīn Mahmūd (for assuming kingship)". The undisputed right of the faction in power to instal its own candidate on the throne is established by the fact that Jalal ud-Dīn Mas'ūd, the governor of Qanauj and the elder brother of Nāsir ud-Dīn Mahmūd, was not even considered for the throne.

It could be assumed that prior to Mahmūd's accession, a secret agreement envisaging the faithfulness of the new ruler to Balban's party had been concluded with Malika'-i-Jahan, the mother of Mahmūd.² The modus operandi of Mahmūd's journey to Delhi from Bahraich supports

¹'Isāmī, p.139.

²T.N., p.201. Habib ullah, p.120. He says that Mahmūd's accession resulted from personal ambitions and was a palace affair in which Balban, in league with Mahmūd's mother, had a hand.

such an assumption. Minhāj says, 'The Malka-i-Jahān, his (Mahmūd's) mother, represented to the people that her son was going to Delhi for the purpose of obtaining medicine and remedy of his sickness. She placed the Sultān on a litter and the Malka his mother, taking him along with her and attended by a great number of domestics, on foot and on horseback, set out from Bahraich towards the capital, Delhi. When night came they covered the Sultān's face with a woman's veil and placed him on horseback and proceeding with maximum speed in a short time reached Delhi in such a manner that not a living being had information of his arrival until the day he ascended the throne.¹

The author of Tārīkh-i Haqqī, who is not a contemporary authority, without quoting his source, tells us that the childless Mahmūd had nominated Balban as his heir-apparent.²

The Tārīkh-i Muhammadi mentions the acquiescence of the nobles on Balban's accession, and so does Baranī. 'Isāmī says that Balban had given indications of his aspiration for the throne. Balban's son Bughra Khān, while advising his son Kaiqubād, mentioned that his father had to face an uphill task in getting to the throne. It is known

¹ T.N., p.209; Dr K.S.Lal, *op.cit.*, p.149, He says, "the way Nāsir ud-Dīn Mahmud got the throne alone shows the power of the nobles."

² 'Abdul Haqq Dehlawi, Tārīkh-i Haqqī, B.M. Or.26,210, f.12b.

that Balban during the reign of Mahmūd had organised a strong body of supporters for himself from among the nobles, which doubtless exerted itself in getting him the throne.¹

The main consideration of the powerful faction in raising someone to the throne was to keep power in its own hands. Whether the accession conformed to the prescribed conditions or not hardly concerned the nobles.² If it suited their interest a Radiya could be placed on the throne or an infant son of Kaiqubād, Kaimurth, was made the king.³

¹ 'Iṣāmī, pp.153-4; Baranī, pp.149-50, says, Bughrā Khān told Kaiqubād, "My father had to wade through blood to attain the kingdom of Delhi ... which was the object of his ambition, and that he had wrested it from the hands of men who were possessed of all the advantages of birth, . Sir W. Muir, The Caliphate, p.303, Sir Muir says, When Mu'āwiya met resistance to his nomination at Medina, "he called out the bodyguards and at the point of the sword, caused the city to take oath."

² David de Santillana, 'Law and Society', The Legacy of Islam, p.296. Being a male adult is an indispensable condition of kingship; al-Mawardi, op.cit., p.13; He does not expressly say 'male adult' but the qualifications which he lays down clearly mean it; Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi, p.184; C.Huart, 'Imam', Encyclopaedia of Islām, Vol.II (old edition), p.473.

³ Tripathi, op.cit., p.43; On the enthronement of Kai Kāus (Kaimurth) Tripathi says, "The supporters of the Albarī house wanted to keep power even by taking shelter behind a child." S.R.Sharma, Studies in Medieval Indian History, p.84, says, "The great public officials usually functioned as king-makers placing now one prince, now another on the throne, sometimes doing so in a spirit of mockery.", Siyāsatnāma, p.183; Nizām ul mulk says "women should not be allowed to interfere in state affairs, because they are wearers of veil and are devoid of complete intelligence; Fakhr-i Mudabbir, Adāb ul Muluk wa kifayāt ul Mamlūk, I.O. 647, f.53a, quotes the Prophet - 'Women should never be consulted and whatever they say ought not to be listened to.'

CHAPTER VI

Social and Cultural life of the Nobles

With the Turkish invasion of India in the twelfth century, the nobles of the Delhi Sultanate became the dominating factor in Muslim social life. The invaders on their arrival came in contact with a Hindu social system which was rigid in details¹ and deeply influenced by superstitions. At the initial stage, therefore, close social contact between the Muslims and the caste-ridden Hindūs was only remotely possible. Describing the abhorrence of the conquered for the invaders, a twentieth century Indian writer observes, "the leaders of Indian society regarded themselves as Aryans, i.e., a race superior to any in the world, while the customs and manners of the Turks appeared to them to be so contemptible, low and vulgar that they called² them 'melechchha' or the unclean". It was in the context of

1 Albiruni's India, Translated by E.C. Sachau, Vol.I, pp. 100-104, 125 and Vol.II, p.137. At the top of the Indian Society there were four varnas or castes, the Brahman, the Kshatriya, the Vaishya and the Sudra. Only the Brahman and the Kshatriya could learn the Vedas; they were the exclusive heirs to the spiritual and intellectual achievements of Hinduism. The remaining two castes were assigned a lower place in the social hierarchy and were deprived of all sacred knowledge. If any one of them dared to hear, pronounce or recite vedic texts, he was hauled up by Brahmans before the ruler who ordered his tongue to be cut off.

2 A.B. Pandey, Society and Government in Medieval India, p.11; Albiruni's India, Trans. by E.C. Sachau, Vol.II, p.101; India in the fifteenth century, (ed. by R.H. Major), 'The travels of Nicolo Conti in the East', p.31, where we read: "While they call other nations blind, that they themselves have two eyes and that we have but one, because they consider that they excel all others in prudence."

such an attitude that the Turks were obliged to establish the pattern of their social behaviour. The economic circumstances of the country also, greatly influenced their social and cultural outlook.

Among the nobles, a body parallel to the highest class of the Hindus was created. They replaced the Hindu ruling class¹ and discharged almost the same functions as the Kshatriyas of the Hindu period, their chief responsibility being the preservation of the institutions of religion and the protection of the kingdom from foreign invasions. In order to mark their status and authority, they were invested with titles, such as Ulugh Khān, Khān, Malik, Amīr, Sipahsālār and Sarkhail. Ulugh Khān (Great Khān) was the² highest title, but it was rarely awarded; while the titles³ Sipahsālār and Sarkhail denoted junior military status and were not in much use.

For their subsistence and also for the maintenance of troops⁴ under them, they were given large assignments from the revenues.

1 F.W. Thomas, Mutual Influences of Muhammadans and Hindūs in India, p.29.

2 In the history of the Delhi Sultānate, only Balban had held the title of Ulugh Khān.

3 Otto Spies, op.cit., p.67, where we read that none of the Sipahsālārs are considered worthy to be near the Sultān. A sipahsālār had less than a hundred horsemen as his followers; Barani, p.145, says that a Sipahsālār would command a hundred horsemen and the Sarkhail, ten.

4 Masālik ul Absār fi Mamālik ul Amsār, quoted in History of India as told by its own Historians, Elliot and Dowson, Vol.III, p.577.

Contemporary and later records are in accord that the allowance of the nobles was very substantial. The Tabagāt-i-Nāsiri states that the allowance of a sar-i-jāndār was three hundred thousand jitals.¹ On the authority of Shaiḡh Mubārak ul-Anbātī, the Subh ul Ashā informs us that the allowance of a Khān was two lakh tankas, of a Malik fifty to sixty thousand tankas, of an Amīr thirty to forty thousand tankas, and of a Sipahsālār nearly twenty thousand tankas.² The statement of 'Afīf confirms that these figures are not imaginary, for Khān-i-jahān the famous wazīr of Fīrūz Tughlaq received, in addition to the allowances he would draw from the state-treasury, a sum of thirteen lakh tankas as revenue from his assignment.³ The contemporary writer Fakhr-i Mudabbir says that when the Turks left their own country they were without any capital, but after their arrival in India they came to possess immense wealth and slaves.⁴

1 T.N., p.237; Hobson-Jobson, A.yule, p.457, where it is said that the jital is "a very old Indian denomination of copper coin, now entirely obsolete - the jital of the Delhi coinage of 'Alaud-Dīn (c.1300) was, according to Mr. E. Thomas's calculations, 1/64 of the silver 'tanga', the coin called in later days the rupee. Ibn Battūta, translated and selected by H.A.R. Gibb, pp. 187-188, informs us that the governors received 1/20th part of the total revenue. 'Alā ul Mulk's allowance (as the governor of Laharī (in Sindh) came to three lakhs. The governor of Uchch, Jalāl ud-Dīn gave Ibn Battūta the revenue of his village, which within a short time yielded him five thousand ḏīnārs.

2 Otto Spies, op.cit., pp. 71-72, the allowance of other officers was also considerable.

3 'Afif, p.197.

4 Tārīkh-i Fakhr ud-Dīn Mubārak Shāh, pp. 20, 36.

The nobles on acquiring wealth, which could not be inherited by their successors, would indulge in indiscriminate liberality simply to satisfy their wayward fancies. Minhāj states, that Mu'izz al-Dīn while marching to India halted at Kirmān, where Tāj ud-Dīn yalduz the governor, displayed his large-heartedness by distributing one thousand head-dresses and quilted tunics to the amīrs and maliks, and gifts to the entire retinue, besides feasting them. The same writer says that Imāmzādah Jalāl ud-Dīn son of Jamāl ud-Dīn Ghaznavī was presented with a sum of five thousand tankas by Ghiyāth ud-Dīn 'Iwād Khaljī and his nobles for delivering a single religious discourse, and while he was returning home, he was given another five thousand.¹

Regarding the frivolous spending of the nobles, Baranī tells us that Balban, while a khān, had been addicted to wine-drinking. He was fond of arranging convivial parties two or three times a week, at which the khāns, maliks and notables were invited to indulge in gambling, wine-drinking, and enjoying music. For his gay parties he kept in his permanent employment sweet-tongued nadīms, melodious-voiced kitāb-khwāns, and reputed musicians, who were also maintained by him.²

† T.N., pp.132-133, 161-162; Baranī, p.113. Malik 'Ala ud-Dīn, the nephew of Balban, presented all his horses to Khwaja Shams Mu'in, whose poem had been sung in his praise, and to the musicians he gave ten thousand rupees.

2 Baranī, p.46. Balban would also bestow gifts at his pleasure parties; Clement Huart, Ancient Persia and Iranian Civilisation, p.145. During the Sassanid period, the musicians were in great demand at the Court. They appeared in ceremonies and, also, accompanied the king when he went out hunting.

'Imād ul mulk a slave of Iletmish and the rawat-i 'ard of Balban would frequently summon his subordinates and present robes to each of them. He would, also, give them twenty thousand tankas to distribute proportionately according to their ranks among ¹ themselves. At times he would entertain his whole department with sumptuous dishes; whatever remained of the rich food, he ² ordered to be distributed to the poor.

Baranī's language reflects his extreme dissatisfaction with the extravagance of the nobles, when he says, "If one khān or malik would learn that another khān or malik had five hundred guests on his victual-carpet, he would feel mortified if he could not entertain one thousand. If a noble heard that a certain malik had given at the time of riding two hundred tankas as charity, he would feel humiliated until he had given four hundred tankas on a similar occasion for the same purpose. If it came to be known that a noble had donated fifty horses and clothed two hundred people in a wine-drinking party, others would become jealous and arrange to bestow ³ one hundred horses and clothe five hundred people." Owing to

1 Baranī, p.115; K.A. Nizāmī, Religion and Politics in India in the thirteenth century, p.149. Nizāmī is incorrect in saying that the total cost of the entertainment was twenty thousand tankas.

2 Baranī, p.116. the dinner consisted of flour-bread, mutton, sweet-paste, pigeon and chickens, round loaf, roasted rice, drinks of rice and fruit, syrup and betel-leaf; Mrs. Meer Hasan 'Alī, Observations on the Mussulmans of India, Vol.I, p.326; the dinner table of a rich person consisted of boiled rice, sweet rice, kheer (pudding made of rice and milk), mutanjan (chicken with rich spices), curries of many varieties some cooked with vegetables, others with unripened fruits (with or without meat), keebabs, pillaus, preserves, pickles and chutneys, and many other things, which she thinks are too tedious to be mentioned.

3 Baranī, pp.119-120.

such senseless expenditures, there was left no trace of gold and silver in the house of the nobles and they remained constantly in debt to the Hindu money-lenders.¹

'Afif tells of a few nobles who were possessed of an extreme love for Mammon, and who inspite of being fully conscious that the law of escheat was operative in their case, could not resist their temptation for hoarding wealth. After the death of Malik Shāhin, a noble of Fīrūz Tughlaq, a sum of fifty thousand was found in cash, besides other valuables and property.² Another noble, Bashir, left thirteen crores of tankas when he died.³ But these were the exceptions and not the rule.

There is definite evidence that the lesser nobility, also, led a luxurious life. 'Alā ud-Dīn, on discovering that the Khuts and Mugaddams⁵ rode on fine horses, wore fine clothes, shot with Persian bows, made war upon each other, drank wine, and went out hunting, thought it necessary to frame stringent measures to

1 Bortani p.120; Sir Wolseley Haig, op.cit., p.56 says that Iletmish being more generous than his master (Qutb ud-Dīn) is little to his credit, for the useless and mischievous prodigality of eastern rulers is more often the fruit of vanity than of any finer feeling and at a Court at which a neat epigram or a smart repartee is almost as profitable as a successful campaign the resources of a country are wasted on worthless objects."

2 'Afif, p.297.

3 Ibid, p.440.

4 W.H. Moreland, The Agrarian system of Muslim India, pp.225,226. Moreland assumes that a khut was a Hindu chief subject to the Sultan; according to the measures taken against them by 'Alā ud-Dīn Khaljī, the view appears to be correct. Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi, p.195. Qureshi says, "the khut was an agent or middleman who helped the government in assessment and realization of revenue from the administered territories".

5 Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi, p.194, where it is said that the 'Mugaddam' was the headman of the village through whom the government dealt with the peasants.

curb their affluence, which would also serve to make them more
¹
 obedient.

The superfluous wealth had made some of the nobles extremely prodigal, and although it was not an age of national reconstruction, it is not unlikely that their ~~cash~~ expenditure adversely affected the standard of living of the common man. In those days when the
²
 cost of living was extremely cheap, Malik Qutb ud-Dīn 'Alwī, a noble of Jalāl ud-Dīn Khaljī had spent two hundred thousand tankas on the marriage of his eldest son. On the wedding day he also presented robes to one thousand persons, and distributed a hundred
³
 horses with trappings.

The dress of the nobles was in keeping with their material property. They wore costly clothes embroidered with gold and
⁴
 silver in delicate designs. According to Shaiikh Mubārak al Anbatī the (official) dress of the Sultān, khans, maliks and other army officers were Tartaric gowns, Takhlawāt, and Islamic qabas of

1 Baranī, pp.287-288.

2 Otto Spies, op.cit., pp.56-57, where it is stated that in the early fourteenth century, four persons could eat at Delhi, beef, bread and melted butter (ghee), to their full satisfaction for one jital only.

3 Barani, pp.202, 118, says that Malik Amīr 'Alī, the sar-i jandar was the son of a slave of Balban. For his unbounded generosity he was styled Hatim (a legendary name for munificence); he never gave a horse or robe to anyone without a purse of silver, and to beggars he would always give either a gold or a silver coin; the copper coin jital was beneath his consideration.

4 Ibn Battuta, trans. by H.A.R. Gibb p.206. When Ibn Battuta saw Muhammad Tughlaq for the first time, he took him to be one of the chamberlains; Society and Government in Medieval India, p.205; G. Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, Vol. IV, p.154.

1

Khwarazm buckled in the middle of the body, and short turbans not exceeding five or six fore-arms in length. On the usual dress of the nobles, Ash-Sharīf Naṣīr ud-Dīn Muhammad al-Hussainī al-Ādamī informs us that it was a gold embroidered Tartaric gown; some of them wore gold embroidered sleeves and others put the embroidery between the shoulders. Their head-dress was four-cornered in shape, ornamented with jewels and mostly inlaid with diamonds and rubies. They plaited their hair in hanging locks as it used to be done in the beginning of the Turkish rule in Egypt and Syria, except that they put silk tassels in the locks. They would fasten gold and silver belts round their waists, and wear shoes and spurs. The sword was attached to the waist only when they were out on journey. The wazīrs and khatībs, also, dressed like soldiers, but they had no belts. According to Sirāj-ud-Dīn al-Hindī, clothes made of Russian and Alexandrian cotton could be worn only if they had been presented by the Sultān.

The Masālik ul Absār says that in the reign of Muḥammad Tughlaq rich materials were imported from China, 'Iraq and Alexandria, and four hundred silk-weavers remained employed in the royal factory for manufacturing silk-cloth; these were to be

1 Otto Spies, op.cit., p.69.

2 Otto Spies, op.cit., pp. 69-70; George Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, ^{vol. IV} p.180, "where it is said that the officers of the Court wore either the long Median robe (which was of various colours) and the fluted cap, or the close fitted Persian tunic and trousers of loose felt. All had girdles in which sometimes a dagger was placed, and all had collars of gold about their necks, and ear-rings of gold in their ears. Sometimes, over the Persian tunic a sleeved cloak or great coat, reaching to the ankles, was worn; Medieval India, S. Lane-Poole, p.38; describes the dress of Khawaja Hasan Maimandi when he made his first appearance before Amir Mas'ud.

given as presents or as robes of honour to the persons who were attached to his court. Also, five hundred manufacturers of golden tissues were kept in the royal service for weaving gold brocades; these were worn by the wives of the Sultan, and were given as presents to the amīrs and their wives.¹

It was a common practice with the Muslim rulers of India to present rich dresses on some happy occasion, or in recognition of one's services. Rukn ud-Dīn Fīrūz, on his accession in 1236 A.D. presented robes of honour to the nobles who were present in the court.² Even nobles would offer a robe to visitors of distinction. Ibn Battuta was presented a robe of goathair by the wazīr of Muhammad Tughlaq.³

The khāns, maliks, and amīrs, would always ride with flags in order to symbolise their authority. According to the Subh ul 'Ashā the khān was attended with seven flags and the amīr with three. It could be assumed that the flags of the Maliks were less than that of the Khāns and more than that of the amīrs. A khān was authorised to keep ten extra horses in his house, and the amīr⁴ three, similarly a figure between the two could be supposed

¹ Masalik ul Absār fi mamalik ul Amsar, quoted in History of India as told by its own Historians, Elliot and Dowson, Vol.III, p.578.

² Clement Huart, Ancient Persia and Iranian Civilisation, p.148; says, "The gift of a robe of honour from the kings wardrobe was a very ancient custom, and survived in the East until our own time, when it was superseded in the XIXth century by orders of knighthood copied from Europe." T.N., pp.182, 242. Minhāj says that 'Izz ud-Dīn Tughril-i Tughan Khan received a rich dress from Iletmish when he was appointed Chashnigir.

³ Ibn Battuta, translated by H.A.R.Gibb, p.206; T.N., p.295, When Balban was a noble, he conferred upon Minhāj a dress of honour, a great roll of gold-brocade cloth, a bay horse saddled and bridled and a village in Hānsi, yielding a revenue of thirty thousand jitals yearly.

⁴ Otto Spies, op.cit., p.77.

in the case of the maliks.

The building of the nobles were often situated near the royal palace. This helped to establish more intimate relationship between themselves and the Sultān, and, also, facilitated the performance of their official duties.¹

Baranī says, that when Mu'izz ud-Dīn Kaiqubād moved to Kilukhrī with the princes, nobles, intimates and servants, he built there a beautiful palace on the bank of a stream and also laid down a garden of unequalled beauty. When the princes, chiefs, confidants, men of learning and officials noticed that the king was inclined to stay at Kilukhrī/^{they} also, went and built their houses there.² Amīr Khusrāu, who had himself been a noble (ahl-i qalam) describes the house of a noble, as usually a big building with spacious apartments, containing drawing rooms, baths, a water-tank, a court yard and even a library.³

In spite of the opportunities for closer contacts and better relationship, the nobles were torn apart by their mutual jealousies. That personal

¹ Masālik ul Absār fī Mamalik ul Amsār, quoted in, History of India as told by its own Historians, Elliot and Dowson, Vol. III where it says that the nobles were required to wait upon the Sultān twice a day, morning and afternoon.

² Baranī, p. 130.

³ Ijāz-i Khusrāvi, Vol V, pp 58, 87-88.

ambition and greed for material prosperity were at the root of their rivalries cannot be doubted. When Qutb ud-Dīn received Muhammad Bakhtiyār with much respect and marks of distinction at Badaūn, the nobles present in the court became filled with envy and began to slander him to the fore; and with the design of bringing about Bakhtiyār's destruction they attributed to him ^{the} foolish boast that he could overcome an elephant in single combat. Bakhtiyār had in fact never said such a thing, but the nobles persuaded Qutb ud-Dīn that the vain glorious statement should be demonstrated. Bakhtiyār accepted the challenge and with one stroke of his mace put the elephant to flight.¹ The vindictive nature of Balban came to the fore when he had Qutb ud-Dīn Hussain, the nā'ib-i mulk, murdered in the open court.² If Baranī is correct, the same Balban poisoned Shīr Khān, a cousin of his, whom he feared to be a potential claimant to the throne, after his death.³

As the nobles had formed themselves into a distinct social class, it seems more than certain that almost all marriages were contracted within

¹ T.N. (ed. Chugh tā'ī), pp 61, 96; Kabīr Khān and Salārī had joined Radiya on the assurance that their allies, Malik Jānī, Malik Kochī, and Nizām ul mulk Junaidī, who had marched with them against her, would be imprisoned.

² 'Isāmī, p.154, 'Isāmī says that the sharp-tongued Qutb ud-Dīn Hussain had passed some unsavoury remarks when Balban entered the Court with the white chatr (canopy, umbrella) over his head; T.N. p.220. Minhāj says, that Qutb ud-Dīn Hussain was imprisoned and slain on the orders of Nasir ud-Dīn Mahmud, as he had made some stinging remarks.

³ Baranī, p.65; T.N.p.257. Minhāj mentions, that Tāj ud-Dīn Sanjar-i-Qiqluq died of poison which was given to him in a betel by a certain party (of nobles), as they had become envious of his qualities and growing strength.

their own circle.¹ The ruler, also, coming of the same stock as the nobles, had no hesitation to enter into matrimonial alliances with the latter. Some rulers showed personal interest in the marriage of their nobles, and, also, used their influence to promote better relationships by marriage among the upper class. Minhāj says that Sultān Mu'izz al-Dīn was instrumental in getting Qutb ud-Dīn married to the daughter of Taj ud-Dīn Yalduz; another daughter of Yalduz was married to Naṣir ud-Dīn Qubācha. Of the three daughters of Qutb ud-Dīn, one was married to Iletmish and the other two to Naṣir ud-Dīn Qubācha.² Prince Muḥammad, the eldest son of Balban was married to the daughter of Iletmish.³ Balban's other son Bughra Khān was married to the daughter of Naṣir ud-Dīn Mahmūd, the eldest son of Iletmish.⁴ That they did not have a sectarian view in the matter of matrimonial relationship is established by the fact, that most of the

¹ William Archer, India and the Future, p. 100 The author is of the opinion that "Inter-class marriages are of doubtful advantage, because marked differences of education and social tradition are not conducive to married happiness".

² T.N. pp. 133, 141, 142, 265; Minhāj says that Iletmish had arranged the marriage of Malik Taj ud-Dīn Arsalan Khān with the daughter of Baha ud-Dīn Tughril.

³ T.A., Vol. I, p. 88; Muḥammad Ma'sūm 'Alī, Tārīkh-i-Sūd, translated by G.G. Malet, pp 28, 29.

⁴ Ḥabīb u'llāh, op. cit., p. 161; It is more probable that Bughra Khān was married to the daughter of the elder Naṣir ud-Dīn Mahmūd who was Iletmish's eldest son, and not to the daughter of the younger Mahmūd by a second wife as stated by Ḥabīb u'llāh. Minhāj does not mention that Sultān Naṣir ud-Dīn Mahmūd had any living child, and 'Abdul Haq says, that Balban was nominated successor by Naṣir ud-Dīn Mahmūd since the Sultān had no child. (Tārīkh-i-Haqqī) B.M. Or. 26, 210, f 12a.

nobles offered to marry outside the community, if the other party belonged to the same status. This was encouraged only where the male was a Muslim and the female a Hindū, and not otherwise. The seventeenth century historian Firishṭā, who, of course, is no authority for the events of the twelfth century, says that Mu'izz al-Dīn had married the daughter of a Rājput Chief.¹ 'Ala ud-Dīn Khaljī had taken Kamla Devī as his wife, and his son had married, Deval Rani, a daughter of the latter by her first husband.² Fīrūz Tughlaq's mother was the daughter of a Rājput chief. 'Afīf furnishes the interesting account of Sipahsālār Rajab's marriage with Fīrūz's mother.³

It is extremely doubtful that these alliances led to any strong bond of unity among the nobles. Instances are not wanting of nobles connected by such ties who gave precedence to their personal ambition and remained engaged in conflict with one another.⁴

¹ Tārīkh-i Firishṭa Vol. I, p. 98; D.F. Mulla, Principles of Muhammadan Law, pp 217, 219 (sec. 200, 204a), "Marriage with an idolatress is irregular, but the irregularity could be removed by the wife becoming a convert to Islam.

² 'Isāmī, p. 324; Ishwarī Prasad, Medieval India, p. 280.

³ 'Afīf, pp 37-39. Fīrūz Tughlaq's mother was originally styled as 'Bībī Na'ila', but after her marriage with Sipahsālār Rajab, Ghiyath-ud-Dīn Tughlaq gave her the name of Bībī Kad-Banu.

⁴ Baranī, pp 234-235, 249; 'Ala ud-Dīn Khaljī treacherously murdered his father-in-law to occupy the throne and, also, killed his other in-law relations whom he considered obstacles in his path; 'Isāmī, p. 234; Tārīkh-i-Mubarak Shāhī p. 69.

Tāj ud-Dīn Yalduz did not hesitate to march against his son-in-law Qubācha to deprive him of his territory. Qutb ud-Dīn waged war against his father-in-law, Yalduz, and expelled him from Ghazna. Balban appeared all set for an armed conflict with his son-in-law, Nāṣir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd, and if Ibn Battūṭa and 'Isāmī are correct, he poisoned the latter to occupy the throne.¹

Baranī says that a common characteristic of the nobles was to name their sons after Prophet Muḥammad. This was obviously intended to invoke the blessings of the name,² and, also, to show respect to the founder of the Islāmic faith.³ Whatever the spirit, in practice their life was contrary to most of the preachings of Muḥammad. The armed attack on the congregation offering prayer in the mosque,⁴ and the invitation by the religious men, whom Minhāj tauntingly calls dastār-baudān, to the rival group of nobles to come and occupy the throne of Delhī, provide ample proof that religion was used only as a

¹ T.N., pp. 134, 143, 219; Baranī, p. 286. In order to prevent conspiracies for rebellion 'Alā ud-Dīn Khaljī ordered that nobles and great men should neither visit each other's houses, nor give feasts, nor organize meetings. They were also, forbidden to form family alliances without permission from the throne.

² 'Afīf, p. 278. While reciting the Qurān, Fīrūz Tughlaq would with great fervour kiss that spot where he would find the name of God.

³ Baranī, p. 66, says that although all the sons of the eminent Khāns who had been named Muḥammad became famous, the one most distinguished among them was Prince Muḥammad, the eldest son of Balban.

⁴ T.N. p. 189. Minhāj states that the attack took place during the reign of Radiya, while 'Isāmī (Futūḥ u's Salāṭin, pp. 116-117) mentions the attack in the reign of Iltutmish.

slogan of war, and morality was at a low ebb during the period. Minhāj describes Nūr Turk as a leader of heretics, and accuses him of having instigated an armed attack on a prayer gathering in the mosque in the reign of Rādīya; while Nizām ud-Dīn Aulīya, a highly respected contemporary saint, has praised the piety and integrity of the latter.¹

As a rule, the mystics and religious divines were treated with consideration and respect by the nobles. Iletmish would always say after he had become king that whatever he had achieved he owed to the benediction of a saint.² Regarding Balban we know that he would take his meals in the company of the learned men, and would visit the tombs of religious men after Friday prayer.³ Nizām ud-Dīn Aulīya mentions Shīr Khān as being hostile to the saints, but assigns no reason for his attitude.⁴

¹ Fawā'id ul Fawā'id (Urdu translation by Malik Fadl ud-Dīn), pp 155, 161; Nizām ud Dīn Aulīya says that Nur Turk was an 'Alīm (a learned man) and he finally settled at Mecca; T.N., p.189. Minhāj alleges that Nūr Turk had called the 'Ulemā Nasībī and Murjī. (According to Nizām ud-Dīn Aulīya, the Rafidīs were called Nasībīs.) Professor W.M Watt, Islamic philosophy and Theology, pp.35, 52, says that the Murjī'ites held the belief that a person accused of grave sin should not be ex-communicated but ought to be given the prescribed punishment for his offence; the final judgement should be left to God on the Last Day. The Rafidīs sincerely believed that 'Alī should have succeeded Muḥammad as the Imām; D.S. Margoliouth, Early development of Muhammadanism, p.224, where it is stated that Murjīs believed in the precedence of faith over works.

² T.N. p.167. 'Isāmī, p.112 'Isāmī calls Iletmish a pious "Pārsā" ruler; Baranī, pp.331-332, 'Alā ud-Dīn Khaljī openly expressed his devotion to Nizām ud-Dīn Aulīya during the Warrangal expedition.

³ Baranī, p.46; Fawā'id ul Fawā'id, (Urdu translation), pp 188, 189. Nizām ud-Dīn Aulīya testifies that Balban possessed a strong faith, he never missed any of his prayers and was punctual in the Friday prayer

⁴ Fawā'id ul Fawā'id (Urdu translation), p.179. Nizām ud-Dīn Aulīya says that Shīrkhān was not well disposed to Shaikh ul Islām Farīd ud-Dīn, although the Shaikh was a true Muslim divine.

The learned men, also, received much respect from the nobles. The story of Tāj ud-Dīn Yaldūz, as given by Minhāj, is indeed a classic example of the esteem in which teachers were held during the period.¹ Tāj ud-Dīn had placed one of his sons under a preceptor. The teacher once chastised the boy by striking an earthen water-flask on his head, and caused his death. When Tāj ud-Dīn Yaldūz was informed, he instead of taking the teacher to task gave him some money for expenses and advised him to leave the place before the boy's mother learned of it. When Minhāj for the first time proceeded to the court of Iletmish for meeting the latter, the first Malik whom he met was Tāj ud-Dīn Sanjar. The noble offered Minhāj his own seat and also gave him a red apple saying "Take this, Mawlānā, so that it may be auspicious."²

The autocrat, 'Alā ud-Dīn had openly denounced the interference of the 'Ulemā in state-affairs, but nevertheless he would himself at times seek the verdict of the learned men on his policies.³ Baranī furnishes

¹T.N., p.133

²T.N., p.232. Āb-i-Kaṭhān, Dr. S.M.Ikrām, pp.116-117, where we read that Naṣir ud-Dīn Qubāḡā, the governor of Uchch, was a great patron of the learned. Saḍid ud-Dīn Muhammad 'Awfī flourished in his court, and Chāchmāma, the first history of Sind' was written during his governorship. Due to his munificence to scholars a number of learned men thronged his court; Ibn Battūṭa, Transl. H.A.R. Gibb, p.207, where it is stated that in India scholars were called Mawlānā (our master).

³Baranī, pp.290-5; Tāj ul ma'athir, 1486, I.O. f.65b: In spite of his incessant campaigns, Qutb ud-Dīn could spare some time to join the company of the learned and extend patronage to them.

a list of learned men, but that can by no means be considered complete; for on the authority of Shaikh Mubarak ul Anbati we are told that in the mid-fourteenth century in the city of Delhi alone there existed one thousand madrassahs.¹ The term probably is used for all types of educational establishments. These madrassahs undoubtedly were not built exclusively by the rulers but were also the result of private enterprise.² R. Nathan says, "In former times the higher education of Muhammadans was in the hands of men of learning who devoted themselves to the instruction of youth. Schools were attached to mosques and shrines and supported by state grants in cash or land, or by private liberality. Individual instructors of merit were also aided by the state, and land-holders and nobles vied with each other in supporting scholars of repute."³

The nobles, after a successful expedition, showed keen interest in establishing at the captured place, mosques, madrassahs, and monasteries. The mosques were also institutions of learning, where primary education was imparted. This practice continues even

¹ Otto Spies, op.cit., p.29; Baranī, pp.353,354. Baranī admits that a complete list of the learned men would be an exceedingly lengthy work.

² Futūhāt-i Fīrūz Shāhī, quoted in History of India as told by its own Historians, Vol.III, p.383,4, mentions only one madrassah as the contribution of Iletmish. The original text says, "The madrassah of Shams ud-Dīn Iletmish had been destroyed, which I rebuilt and furnished with sandal-wood doors."

³ R. Nathan, 'Education', Imperial Gazetteer of India (new edition), Vol.IV, p.408.

to this day, in Pakistan and India. Religious discourses were held in the dervish monasteries and some of these have been collected into books.¹ Dr Yūsuf Husain describes the madrassahs "as the stronghold of orthodoxy which aimed at stabilizing a body of beliefs and discipline prescribed by these beliefs, around which the entire social structure revolved."² At the initial stage, the founding of such institutions was indeed inevitable. These served not only as the channels through which the philosophy of the Islamic religion was to be made known, but also as the source for supplying the much needed religious personnel, the Qādīs, the Muftīs, the Imāms and other authorities and functionaries of religion. Hasan Nizāmī informs us that Mu'izz al-Dīn after conquering Ajmōr, demolished the temples and established mosques and madrassahs.³ On the authority of Minhāj we know that Muhammad Bakhtiyār and his āmīrs had founded mosques, madrassahs, and monasteries at Lakhnautī, when it was made the seat of government.⁴ There were

¹ N.N. Law, Promotion of Learning in India, p.19. Law says, "Muhammadan learning was promoted by the establishment of hundreds of mosques which like the churches of Medieval Europe were centres of both religion and learning." S.M. Ja'ffar, Education in Muslim India, p.18. Ja'ffar says, "Muslim khanqahs, analogous to the monasteries of Medieval Europe, made provision for education which was mostly religious."; the discourses of Nizām ud-Dīn Auliya enabled his disciple, Hasan 'Alā Sanjarī to compile an invaluable work entitled Fawā'id ul-fawā'id; Early development of Muhammadanism, p.215, where a mosque is described as a place of worship, instruction and debates.

² Yūsuf Husain, Glimpses of Medieval Indian Culture, p.71.

³ Tāj-ul-ma'athir, I.O. 1486, f.43b.

⁴ T.N.(ed. M.A. Chughtai), pp.64,157. Regarding Tāj ud-Dīn Sanjar-i-Qiqluq, Minhāj says that he had founded jami'masjids in several places.

two famous madrassahs in the early period of the Delhi Sultanate; the madrassah-i-Nāsiriya and the madrassah-i-Mu'izzi.¹ The charge of madrassah-i-Nāsiriya was assigned to Minhāj in the reign of Radiya.² This madrassah was built by Iletmish as referred to in the Futūhāt-i-Fīrūzshāhī, who it seems had named it after his eldest son Nāsir ud-Dīn Mahmūd, whom he had designated as his heir-apparent, but who had pre-deceased him. The other madrassah being situated in the cloth-market, was most probably originally a Hindū-temple, which was converted into an educational institution during Aybek's vice-royalty, as the location and name of the institution would suggest.³

The court of Prince Muhammad, the eldest son of Balban, was famous as a meeting place for the men of letters. The prince demonstrated his taste for literature by collecting twenty thousand unique couplets composed by the most celebrated authors. On two occasions he sent presents with messengers to Shirāz to Shaikh Sa'dī, the reputed Persian poet, and invited him to Multān, but the poet could not comply on account of his infirmity and old age.⁴ However, on

¹ Dr Yūsuf Husain (Glimpses of Medieval Indian Culture, p.73) states that the madrassah-i Nāsiriya was built by Balban when he was the Chief Minister, after the name of his master, Nāsir ud-Dīn Mahmūd; S.M.Ja'ffar, Education in Muslim India, p.41. says that the madrassah-i Nāsiriya was built by Sultān Nāsir ud-Dīn Mahmūd himself; T.N., pp.188-9. Both Mr Ja'ffar and Dr Yūsuf appear to be incorrect as Minhāj had held the charge of madrassah i-Nāsiriya in the reign of Radiya, when Balban was of no importance and Nāsir ud-Dīn was then only eight or nine years old.

² T.N., p.188.

³ F.E.Keay, Indian Education in ancient and later times, p.112, says that Qutb ud-Din was a man of literary tastes who destroyed Hindu temples and built many mosques which were centres not only of religious worship but also of education, T.N., p.189.

⁴ Baranī, pp.68-9; Prince Muhammad was a great admirer of the learned, the skilful and the ingenious. Barani quotes Amīr Khusrāu and Amīr Hasan as having said, "if we and other accomplished ones had been fortunate the martyred Khan would have remained alive." N.N.Law(Promotion of Learning in India, p.24, n.2) is entirely wrong in stating that the sixth sphere of Khusrāu's Nuhsipihr refers to the education of Prince Muhammad, the son of
(continued on next page)

both the occasions he sent to the prince verses written in his own hand, and also praised in a prolific manner the abilities of Amīr Khusrau, who according to Firishta was the most esteemed member of the prince's learned society.¹ Amīr Hasan 'Alā Sanjarī, styled the Sa'dī of India and Amīr Khusrau basked in the sunshine of the prince's patronage. Baranī says that the reputation of Prince Muhammad's literary tastes and his patronage extended to scholars attracted to his court the most learned and accomplished men of his time. In his literary gatherings, his attendants would read the Shāh-nāma, the Dīwān-i Sanā'ī, the Dīwān-i Khagānī and the Khamṣa of Nizāmī, while the knowledgeable would review the literary merits of these works.²

Whatever the status and authority of a noble, he was required to observe the court etiquette when he appeared before the Sultān. Bughra Khān was obliged to follow the court ceremonials, when he approached his son, Mu'izz ud-Dīn Kaiqubād, the Sultān of Delhi.

(continued from previous page)

⁴ Balban. In fact, it gives an account of the education of Mubārak Khaljī's son, who was also called Prince Muhammad; Baranī, pp.144-45. Baranī makes some reference to the education of both sons of Balban; Tarikh-i Firishta, Vol.I, pp.137-8.

¹ J. Briggs, op.cit., Vol.I, p.259.

² T.A., Vol.I, p.87. Nizām ud-Dīn, tells us that Prince Muhammad always associated with accomplished men whom he esteemed more than any of his other courtiers; cf. Baranī, pp.67, 197-8, who says, Jalāl ud-Dīn Khaljī was a great appreciator of talents. The day he was appointed the 'Ard-i mamalik, he fixed twelve hundred tankas as allowance for Amīr Khusrau, the same amount that Khusrau's father used to receive; Tarikh-i Firishta, Vol.I, p.137; J. Briggs, op.cit., Vol.I, p.252. Firishta says that Balban's second son, Bughra Khān, also organised a society which consisted of musicians, dancers, actors and story tellers.

After Bughrā had made obeisances and kissed the ground thrice, Mu'izz ud-Dīn Kaiqubād casting aside all pretensions of royalty, fell at the feet of his father and began to weep, a scene that touched the hearts of all the courtiers who were present.¹

A noble while appearing in the Darbār was required to don the Khila't (robe) bestowed by the Sultān, otherwise he was to come in the dress usually worn by people of his rank; the cap being an essential part of the dress.² In the court a special row was assigned for the nobles.³ Usually they would stand behind the throne, but in some cases would also have a place on the ruler's left.⁴

It was customary for the nobles to bring presents when they came to the Darbār.⁵ The governors of the provinces, as token of their

¹ Baranī, pp.142-3; Otto Spies, op.cit., p.73; According to custom, no one even with a small knife can have access to the Sultān; J.P.Tavernier, Travels in India, Vol.I, p.302; According to Tavernier, obeisances consist in placing the hand three times on the ground, and as often on the head and at the same time praying for the Emperor's health and long life, and the power to vanquish his enemies.

² 'Afīf, p.280; G.Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, Vol.IV, p.154. Rawlinson says "The Persian ruler was distinguished by his headdress which was peculiar alike in shape and colour."

³ Ibn Battuta, Trans. by H.A.R.Gibb, p.199. Ibn Battuta records that the wazīr stands in front of the Sultān, the functionaries and nobles stand along the hall to the right and left, the secretaries stand behind the wazīr, then comes the chamberlains, and others behind him in order of precedence.

⁴ 'Afīf, pp.279,283; 'Afīf informs us that the ruler usually addressed the court through his wazīr, in order to dispel any misgivings of strained relations with this important officer of the court; Otto Spies, op.cit., p.73; where it is said that the ministers stood around the ruler on the Sultan's right and left and behind were the armour-bearers, while the Government officers stood before him. Only the khāns, the sadr-i-jahan, and the dabīran, who were on duty had the right to sit.

⁵ Ibn Battuta, Trans. by H.A.R.Gibb, p.200 says that a donor was required to make three obeisances before reaching the Sultān, and had to make another at the station of the Chamberlain. The Sultān, out of courtesy, would ask for some part of the present and then, turning it this way and that way, would express his approval.

allegiance, would send presents to the Sultān if they did not come in person. Bughrā Khān, the father of the king of Delhi, sent numerous presents to his son from the eastern bank of the Sarjū, where he had encamped.¹ Bernier, the seventeenth century traveller describing the general custom of Asia, says, "In Asia, the great are never approached empty-handed."² In the fifteenth century, 'Abd-ur-Razzāq, the ambassador from emperor Shāh Rukh presented five beautiful horses and some costly dresses to the king of Vijaynagar.³

The Sultān usually reciprocated by conferring a title, or increasing the rank, or giving gifts of greater value. In the reign of Muḥammad Tughlaq shrewd traders would advance money to an intending visitor to the Sultān for bringing presents and would later share the profits resulting from the return gifts of the sovereign.⁴

While the ruler interpreted the present as an expression of loyalty and respect by the noble, it was in fact a form of bribe,

¹ Baranī, pp.143,144.

² Francois Bernier, *Travels in the Mogul Empire*, p.200. Bernier informs us that as a mark of respect, he presented eight rupees to emperor Aurangzib when he was first taken before the emperor.

³ *India in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. R.H.Major, "Journey of 'Abd-ur Razzāq", p.30.

⁴ *Ibn Battūta*, Trans. by H.A.R.Gibb, pp.184-5. Ibn Battūta says that the merchants in Sind and India place both their money and their persons at the service of any new visitor to the Sultān. When the visitor is requited with a magnificent gift from the Sultān, he pays off his debt to the trader who makes an enormous profit through such transactions; T.N., p.239; Minhāj says that when Saif ud-Dīn Aybek sent some elephants from Lakhnauti to Delhi, he received the title of Nughān tat.

as the noble offering the present expected in return certain favours from the Sultān.¹ Bribery was not an uncommon feature in the administration of the Delhi Sultānate, Baranī says, that in the reign of Balban, two thousand iqṭā'dārs of the days of Iletmish, some of whom had died, still retained possession of their iqṭā's through their sons and slaves. Some of them attended laxly to their military duties, while others obtained exemption by offering bribes of wine, goats, hens, pigeons, oil and corn, to the nā'ib-i-'ard-i mamālik (deputy muster-master), and other officers of the department.² Muhammad Tughlaq had ordered his treasurer to pay off the sum Ibn-Battūta owed to his creditor, but the latter demanded a bribe of five hundred tankas from Ibn Battūta to execute the royal order.³

During the Sultanate period, the judiciary perhaps remained somewhat immune from this social vice. Minhāj has immense praise for the integrity of Dādbak Malik Saif ud-Dīn Aybek.⁴ The conversation between 'Alā ud-Dīn Khalji and Qādī Mughīth ud-Dīn reveals the courage and moral rectitude of the qādī, who at the risk of his life, did not hesitate to tell the autocrat 'Alā ud-Dīn that most of his

¹ Ibn Battūta, Trans. by H.A.R. Gibb, p.198. Ibn Battūta says that if any official is absent for three or more days he presents the Sultān a gift suitable to his rank, if he has a reasonable excuse for his absence.

² Baranī, p.62

³ Ibn Battūta, Trans. by H.A.R. Gibb, p.209. Ibn Battūta, Urdu translation by Ra'īs Ahmed Ja'fari, p.666; once Ibn Battūta had to pay two dinars to a hājib to bring an order of Muhammad Tughlaq in which a gift of twelve thousand din ārs was sanctioned for him.

⁴ T.N., p.275. Minhāj says that wherever Dādbak Saif ud-Dīn Aybek was posted, that tract became prosperous on account of his justice and sincerity, and the people led a quiet and tranquil life.

proceedings were against the Shari'ah, and were therefore illegal.¹

Ibn Battuta was an eye-witness when a certain qādī remained uninfluenced by the personality of the despot, Muhammad Tughlaq, and gave the verdict against him in a suit brought by a noble.²

The nobles used horses and pālkīs (palanquins, litter) for their conveyance. Riding on elephants was the exclusive privilege of the ruler, but in some cases the king would present an elephant to a noble in order to exalt him above his equals.³ The richer class of people also used pālkīs when they travelled over longer distances.⁴

Pālkīs being a comfortable conveyance was usually resorted to, even by rulers. After the first battle of Jara'in in 1191 A.D.

Mu'izz al-Dīn was carried to Ghazna in a litter. In 1236 A.D.

when Iltutmish was attacked with illness during his expedition to Bānyān, he was brought back to Delhi in a similar conveyance.⁵

¹ Baranī, p.295.

² Ibn Battuta, Trans. by H.A.R. Gibb, pp.202-3.

³ T.N., p.236; B.K.Sankar, Inland Transport and Communications in Medieval India, p.57.

⁴ K.M.Ashraf; Life and Conditions of the People of Hindustan, p.274. A Book of Duarte Barbosa, ed. by M.L.Dames, Vol.I, p.121; Barbosa in his description of Western India in the early sixteenth century, says that women used to travel in horse-carriages which were entirely covered, so that no one could see who travels within; Mrs Meer Hasan 'Ali, Observations on the Mussulmans of India, Vol.I, pp.317-9, says that Timur (Tamerlane) invented in India several covered conveyances in order to secure his womenfolk from the contamination of the neighbours. The Hindu women travelled in palanquins, a kind of litter, supported on the shoulders of four bearers two supporting the front pole, and two the pole behind; B.K.Sankar, Inland Transport and Communication in Medieval India, p.56; says that the palanquin was usually carried by four men but for distant journeys eight or twelve men were employed for relieving one another. Being more comfortable, it was more expensive and was generally used by the wealthier members of society.

⁵ T.N., pp.119,176. Minhāj says that spears were broken and made into a litter to carry the wounded Sultan Mu'izz al-Din.

In 1246 A.D., Nāsir ud-Dīn Mahmūd moved out of Bahraich in a litter, but on the way he mounted a horse to reach Delhi more swiftly for his enthronement.¹

The time of a noble was spent mainly in either leading expeditions or in organizing pleasure parties. The political thinker of the thirteenth century, Fakhr-i Mudabbir, considers the former as an essential factor in the life of an individual.² The nobles believed that expeditions and pleasure parties were complementary to each other.³ The pleasure party of a noble included music, wines and gambling; betels were also freely distributed.

The nobles as a body were given to wine drinking. In the history of the nobles, Minhāj mentions with approval a solitary noble who never drank what was forbidden, inferring that the rest drank wine with impunity.⁴ Amīr Khusrau tells us that wine drinking, as a habit, had taken firm root in Muslim society. The women, the 'ulamā, the

¹ T.N., p.209.

² *Adāb-ul Harb wa Shujā'at*, B.M. Add, 16,853, 96b-109b. The author says that the gifts of God are not confined to soul, wisdom and intelligence, but also extend to the use of weapons.

³ *Qirān ul sa'dain*, Amīr Khusrau, p.51. Amīr Khusrau says that after the Mongols were captured, Mu'izz ud-Dīn Kaiqubād ordered a pleasure party to be organized where wine was to flow freely; 'Afif, p.146. During the second expedition against Lakhnauti, Firuz Tughlaq's wine drinking was interrupted by the sudden arrival of Tālār Khān.

⁴ 'Afif, pp.145-6; Firuz Tughlaq had no fixed time for drinking wine. Once he was seen drinking wine after the early morning prayer. His nobles also used to drink different varieties of wine; T.N., p.256.

mu'ezzins all were fond of the forbidden drink.¹ Undoubtedly the common man copied those who claimed to belong to the highest rung of the social ladder. Some rulers having realised the harmful effects of excessive wine-drinking attempted to stop it altogether.

Balban, while a noble, was a hard-drinker, but on becoming king he gave it up totally and also forbade it to the others. But this prohibition had hardly any effect on his own sons.² Bughrā Khān, the youngest son of Balban, was often rebuked by his father for his excessive indulgence in wine;³ while the eldest son, Prince Muhammad, according to Baranī, drank with moderation.⁴ The Tabaqā-i Akbarī says that Prince Muhammad, while in a state of drunkenness, divorced his wife; later, on regaining his senses, he wanted to revoke it, but it was not permissible according to Muslim law.⁵

¹ Matla' ul Anwār, pp.58,194. Amīr Khusraū is very bitter when he says "it is extremely ugly that the 'Ulema' pour wine in the same bosom where they have preserved the Qur'ān."

² Baranī, p.46; Tārīkh us Sebuktigīn, quoted in History of India as told by its own historians, Elliot and Dowson, Vol.II, pp.144-5, which describes the excessive wine-drinking of the nobles; Medieval India, S.LanePoole, p.37.

³ Baranī, p.81. Balban warned his youngest son, Bughrā Khān that if he did not give up his habit of excessive wine-drinking he would be deposed from governorship, Tārīkh-i Firishta, Vol.I, p.138.

⁴ Baranī, p.67.

⁵ Nizām ud-Dīn Ahmad, Tabaqat-i-Akbarī, Vol.I, p.88; The divorce incident as narrated by Nizām ud-Dīn reflects seriously on the moral conduct of Prince Muhammad. Iltmish's daughter was not prepared to go back to the prince, and she told Shaikh Sadr ud-Dīn, to whom she had been married after being divorced by Prince Muhammad, that she had sought shelter in his house from that perfidious man and God would not allow that she should again be made over to his tender mercies. Tārīkh-i-Sind, Muhammad Ma'sum 'Ali Trans. by G.G.Malet, pp.28,29. D.F.Mulla, op.cit., p.263, (sec.243, cl.5); where the husband has repudiated his wife by three pronouncements, it is not lawful for her to marry him again until she has married another man, and the latter has divorced her or died after actual consummation of the marriage.

'Alā ud-Dīn would inflict severe corporal punishment on the wine-bibbers who tried to violate his prohibition, as he had diagnosed it as one of the major causes of rebellion against him.¹ Muḥammad Tughlaq also took stern measures against the wine-drinkers, even confiscating their property as a punishment.²

Wines were usually served by handsome young boys for whom the wine-bibbers had great affection. The rulers and nobles alike, had weakness for handsome young boys.³ Iletmish, according to Minhāj was extremely handsome. It may seem that Qutb ud-Dīn was attracted by the comely appearance of Iletmish, as in spite of the prohibition of his patron and master, Sultan Mu'izz al-Dīn, he could not resist his desire to purchase him. Iletmish's leaning for attractive faces is conclusively affirmed by Minhāj and 'Isāmī. The former demonstrated his admiration by appointing his attractive slaves as his sāqī-i-khaṣ⁴ (personal cup-bearer). The handsome

¹ Baranī, pp.285-6. At first the wine-drinkers were beaten with sticks and then cast into prison, but when their number rose high they were thrown into a well which had been constructed for them near Badāun gate.

² Otto Spies, op.cit., p.64. Shāikh Taj ud-Dīn relates that Muḥammad Tughlaq once arrested one of his khaṣ and confiscated his property for wine-drinking habits.

³ Baranī, pp.160-1. Mu'izz ud-Dīn Kaiqubād, having lost his self-control by the beauty of his male sweet-heart, said "If you be my cup-bearer, who will dare to call it a forbidden thing."

⁴ T.N., pp.168-242. Iletmish appointed 'Izz ud-Dīn Tughril Tughan Khān, a boy of handsome appearance, as his personal cup-bearer; Baranī p.160. The author says that Mu'izz ud-Dīn Kaiqubād and his men were so much enchanted by the charms of a heart-ravishing boy that when the pleasure-party was organised, they declared with unconcealed ardour that they would drink wine from no other hands but his.

Qamr ud-Dīn Qirān-i Tamur Khān was purchased by Iletmish for the fabulous price of fifty thousand jitals.¹ 'Isāmī informs us that when the slave-dealer first presented Balban to Iletmish he was rejected for his ugly appearance.² Male sweethearts had come to play a significant part in the life of the nobles. The fixing of the price of handsome boys by 'Ala ud-Dīn Khajī, when he introduced his price-control system, strongly supports this contention.³ The slave system, and also the camp life of the Turks which had segregated them from the conditions of a normal family life, may be said to have been greatly responsible for promoting this vice among them. Fakhr-i Mudabbir thus gives a curious picture of the restricted sexual life of the Turks in Turkestan: "the men would live on ^{one} banks of the river and the women on the opposite. On a fixed night in the year the women would cross the river and have indiscriminate intercourse since no one had a fixed husband or

¹ T.N., p.247.

² 'Isāmī, p.117; Ibn Battuta, Urdū translation, p.532.

³ Baranī, p.314. In the price control regulation of 'Ala ud-Dīn Khajī the price of a handsome beardless slave-boy ranged from twenty to thirty tankas, that of trained slaves from ten to fifteen tankas, and of untrained slave-boys from seven to eight tankas.

wife, in the morning the women went to their own bank, and except that night throughout the year they never met again. If any man crossed the river and went to the bank where the women lived, he was torn into bits with finger-nails and teeth and killed."¹ Khudā Bakhsh is of the opinion that the germ of sodomy contaminated the Arabs when they came in contact with the Persians, particularly after the ascendancy of the 'Abbāsids.² In the Qābūsname, a book on statecraft and royal manners, Prince Kai Kā'ūs advises his son to confine his sexual inclinations to either sex, so that he could find pleasure from both kinds without embittering relations with either of them.³ The relations of 'Alā ud-Dīn Khaljī with Malik Kāfur and of his son Mubārak with Khusrau Khān are well-known in the history of Muslim India.⁴ Baranī and Nizām ud-Dīn furnish us the dialogues of a love-scene exchanged between Sultan Mu'izz ud-Dīn Kaiqubād and his heart-ravishing boy sweet-heart.⁵ Khudā Bakhsh provides the following explanation for this degenerated behaviour of the aristocracy, "the wealthy debauchee, enfeeble and

¹ Tārīkh-i-Fakhr ud-Dīn Mubārak Shāh, pp.40-1.

² S. Khudā Bakhsh, Studies Indian and Islāmic, p.102.

³ Qābūsname, pp.48-9. C.E. Bosworth, The Ghaznavids, p.103. Bosworth says that the ethical climate of the time did not disapprove physical connections with male slaves.

⁴ Baranī, pp.251,389-390.

⁵ Baranī, pp.159-161; T.A., Vol.I, pp.112-3.

satiated with the enjoyment of the harem looked for new diversions and gaieties, and found them in these revolting practices."¹

The Pardah system or the seclusion of women is ascribed to be originally a Muhammadan institution. According to F.W. Thomas, "in Hindu times women were not encouraged to court publicity, but there was no stringent restriction."² Mrs Meer Hasan 'Alī traces the origin of Pardah to the time of Muhammad. Pardah was then understood merely as the veiling of the face, and 'Āyashā, the wife of Prophet Muhammad, led an army against 'Alī at the 'Battle of Camels.'³ But in India, the lenient Pardah system was abused by the powerful aristocracy.

Prior to the Muslim invasion in 1192 A.D. Prithvirāj, the powerful ruler of Ajmer, had forcibly carried away the beautiful daughter of Raja Jaychand, from Qanauj.⁴ 'Alī refers to the unbecoming and

¹ S. Khudā Bakhsh, Studies Indian and Islamic, p.102; Tavernier's travels in India, Vol.I, p.44, where it is stated that the governor of Brampour had a handsome page who came of a good family. One day when the page noticed that the governor harboured the evil design of committing an immoral offence, he stabbed the governor thrice, killing him.

² F.W. Thomas, Mutual influences of Muhammadans and Hindus in India, p.72.

³ Mrs Meer Hasan Alī, Observations on the Mussulmans of India, Vol.I, pp.316-7.

⁴ A. Yusuf 'Alī, Medieval India, pp.41-5; The author narrates in brief, how Prithvirāj won his bride, Sanjogin, the beautiful daughter of Raja Jaychand of Qanauj; Futūhat-i-Firuzshahi, quoted in History of India as told by its own historians, Elliot and Dowson, Vol.III, p.380. Firuz Tughlaq says when he saw that on holy days women went out of the city to visit the tombs where immoral people found the opportunity to indulge in riotous actions, he ordered that no woman should go out to the tombs and that non-compliance would make them liable to severe upunishment.

sexual morality of the soldiery and the nobles when he puts the following words in the mouth of Khawāja Jahān, "In spite of my army and elephants, Sultān Fīrūz will capture the place and Muslim ladies will fall into the hands of the ruffians of his army."¹ To such conditions could be added the constant fear of Mongol invasion, which had tended to increase the insecurity of the womenfolk. Maintaining innumerable females in the harem for entertainment, had become a fashion with almost every noble. "Afīf informs us that Khān-i Jahān, the wazīr of Fīrūz Tughlaq, was much devoted to the pleasures of the harem, which he had filled with some two thousand women of Rūm and Chīn. He spent most of his time in their company and had a large number of children."² The common man who was not left with more than bare subsistence, could hardly conceive of more than one wife.³

Such conditions had necessitated the strict seclusion of the females, and the custom soon became sacrosanct in Indian society.⁴

¹ Afīf, pp. 69, 70.

² Ibid., p. 400.

³ R. Roberts, Social Laws of the Qur'ān, p. 121; Roberts quotes the extract of a letter which he had received from the Rev. T.W. Reese, Calvinistic Methodist Missionary in Sylhet. Speaking about polygamy in India, Rev. Reese says, "Concubinage among the wealthy is extensively practiced, and also divorce. But among the poor these things involve money, their circumstances act as a sufficient preventative."

⁴ R. Levy, Social Structure of Islām, p. 127. Levy says, that by the time of Harūn al-Rashīd, women belonging to the upper strata were completely secluded from the rest of the household under the charge of eunuch, and by the middle ages it was indeed shocking for an innocent visitor to notice free social intercourse between men and women.

Mrs Meer Hasan 'Alī maintains that the strict privacy of women in India originated with the conquest of Tīmūr (Tamerlane) in December 1398. This was because the conqueror wanted to conceal his female members from the view of the strangers who were idolaters.¹ In India, in the early thirteenth century, Pardah was looked upon as compulsory for the upper class Muslim females. When Radiya discarded the veil, there was strong reaction from all quarters. The thirteenth and fourteenth century writers, Minhāj, Amīr Khusrau and 'Isāmī, all have alike bitterly criticised her action.²

Chewing pān or betel leaves formed an essential item of every social party. On the testimony of Baranī we know that the rāwat-i 'ard of Balban, would employ fifty slaves in his social functions, only for distributing betel-leaves.³ Travellers visiting India have reported that offering betel-leaves in the house of the nobles and also in the royal court was a part of their social etiquette.⁴ A king would honour his visitor by presenting him pān in a silver or golden platter. 'Abd-ur-Razzaq, the ambassador from emperor Shāh Rukh, received along with other presents two packets of betel from the King of Vijaynagar, when

¹ Mrs Meer Hasan 'Alī, Observations on the Mussulmans of India, Vol. I, pp. 317-8; R. Roberts, Social Laws of the Qur'an, p. 122.

² Amīr Khusrau, Matla'ul Anwar, p. 194. The poet advises his daughter that if by keeping indoors her face has become pale, it is better than the redness acquired on the face by viewing strangers. "Do not desire collyrium in your eyes by gazing at people, because by this collyrium your entire face will become black." T.N., p. 177; 'Isāmī, pp. 129-30; 'Isāmī advocates strict seclusion for women.

³ Baranī, p. 117; The pān of the rāwat-i 'ard was famous for its delicacy, which the rāwat frequently consumed and freely distributed to his guests.

⁴ M. Athar 'Alī, The Mughal Nobility under Aurangzib; p. 139. The Mughal Emperors bestowed marks of honour on their nobles even by presenting betel-leaves.

he met him for the first time. On every other occasion when he saw the king, he was given a packet of betel with other presents. During the Mahanadī festival the king gave him some money, some betel, and also some fruits reserved for his own use.¹ 'Abd-ur-Razzāq says, "the betel is a leaf, like that of the orange, but longer. In Hindoostān, the greater part of the country of the Arabs and the kingdom of Ormuz, an extreme fondness prevails for this leaf, which in fact deserves its reputation. The manner of eating it is as follows. They bruise a portion of faufel (areca), otherwise called Siparī, and put it in the mouth. Moistening a leaf of the betel, together with a grain of chalk, they rub the one upon the other, roll them together, and then place them in the mouth. They thus take as many as four leaves of betel at a time, and chew them. Sometimes they add camphor to it, and sometimes they spit out the saliva, which becomes of a red colour. This substance gives a colour to and brightens the countenance, causes an intoxication similar to that produced by wine, appeases hunger and excites appetite in those who are satiated; it removes the disagreeable smell from the mouth and strengthens the teeth. It is impossible to express how strengthening it is and how much it excites to pleasure."²

¹ India in the Fifteenth Century, ed. by E.H. Major, "Journey of 'Abd-ur-Razzāq," p.31.

² Ibid., pp.31-2.

Chewing pān later became part of the Indian culture. Mrs Meer Hasan 'Alī says, "the pān, the dear delightful pān which constitutes the greatest possible luxury to the natives."¹

In an assembly, the pān creates an atmosphere of cordiality, and when consumed alone, it gives a feeling of relaxation. Even these days in Pakistan and India, a visitor is always entertained with tea and pān, while in social functions, several trays of pān are kept at some prominent place for the guests. Mrs Meer Hasan 'Alī is right when she says that in the month of Ramḍān (the fasting month), the Muslims enjoy pān every much in the evening.² 'Abd-ur Razzāq's statement is nothing more than a mere surmise when he says, "it is probable that the properties of this plant may account for the numerous harem of women that the king of this country maintains."³

Polo, horse-riding, archery and chase, were the favourite sports of the nobles.⁴ Qutb ud-Dīn Aybek died of an accident while

¹ Observations on the Mussulmans of India, Mrs Meer Hasan 'Alī, Vol. I, p. 102; Amir Khusrau, Nuh Sipihr, p. 161; The poet says that during his period pān was exclusively the luxury of the upper class, The India of Aurangzib, translated and annotated by Jādū nath Sarkar, pp. lli, Lvi, Lzi, Behar and Malwa were known for the production of betel leaf, while Bengal was famous for growing the finest quality of betel-nut.

² Mrs Meer ^aHsan 'Alī, Observations on the Mussulmans of India, ^{Vol. I,} p. 102.

³ India in the Fifteenth Century, ed. by R. H. Major, "Journey of 'Abd-ur-Razzāq", p. 32. Barani, p. 288. says that the measures of 'Alā ud-Dīn succeeded in stopping the chewing of betel by the chaudhris, Khuts and Mugddams; Amin ud-Din Khan, Muntakhab az kitab-i ma'lunāt ul 'Afāq, B. M., Or. 1741, f. 83b. In North India the senior of the city was known as chaudhri.

⁴ Ab ul Fadl, A'in-i Akbari, Vol. I, pp. 268-70, says that Akbar was fond of playing polo. He played it in dark nights with a fire-ball made of Palas wood, which was light and would burn for a long time. Pigeon flying was also one of his favourite sports, which he discontinued for sometime but resumed on ascending the throne.

playing polo.¹ Baranī says that when 'Alā ud-Dīn Kashlī Khān was appointed Barbak, he was presented a gold polo-stick. Amīr Khusrau is quoted in Baranī's Tārīkh-i Firūz Shāhī as having said, "in generosity, archery, in striking the ball, and in chasing a game, no mother had given birth to one like 'Alā ud-Dīn Kashlī Khān."² Minhāj informs that Malik Taj ud-Dīn Sanjar Kureṭ Khān was highly accomplished in horsemanship, archery and chasing.³

Soon after the establishment of the Muslim kingdom in India, the construction of monumental buildings engaged the attention of the new rulers.⁴ The early architectural activity of the conquerors is thus explained by Fergusson, "Nothing could be more brilliant, and at the same time more characteristic, than the commencement of the architectural career of these Pathans in India. So soon as they felt themselves at all sure of their conquest, they set to work to erect two great mosques in their two principal capitals of Ajmīr and Delhī, of such magnificence as should redound to the glory of their religion and mark their triumph over the idolaters."⁵

¹T.N., pp.140-141.

²Baranī, pp.113,114, says that Hulāgū, having heard about 'Alā ud-Dīn Kashlī Khān's skilfulness in polo and the chase, sent him a knife as a present and offered him half of 'Irāq if he went to him.

³T.N., p.258.

⁴E.B.Havell, Indian Architecture, p.9. The great love of the Muḥammadan conquerors for architecture may be judged by the statement of Havell. "In times of war their (master-builders) lives were often the only one that were spared by the victors in battle or even in the sack of cities, for their services were highly valued by all combatants."

⁵James Fergusson, History of Indian and Eastern Architecture, p.499.

In C.1192 A.D., Qutb ud-Dīn laid the foundation of Quwwat-ul Islām (Might of Islam) mosque at Delhi in order to commemorate its conquest.¹ He also built a mosque known as Arhai-din-ka-jhopra (hut of two and a half days) at Ajmīr, which had been the capital of the vanquished Hindū Rājā, Prithviraj, and according to Percy Brown, was the subsidiary stronghold of the Muslims in Rajputana.² In 1199 A.D., Qutb ud-Dīn laid the foundation of the Qutb Minār (the tower of Qutb), which on its completion came to be regarded as one of the 'Wonders of the World'.

From the balconies of the Qutb Minār, the faithfuls were called to prayer by the mu'ezzin.³ All these constructions had taken place when Qutb ud-Dīn was a noble, but extremely powerful.

Besides the monumental buildings of Delhi, construction work of a purely Muslim style went apace, also, in those parts of India which subsequently came under Muslim occupation. Minhāj informs us that Baha ud-Dīn Tughril founded in the territory of Bayāna, the city of Sultānkot, where numerous proofs of his goodness exist.⁴ The rulers and nobles of the period evinced their interest, not only in religious

¹ Sir Sayyid Ahmed Khān, Āthār ul-Sanādīd, p.67; Percy Brown, Indian Architecture, p.10 says, "the mosque consisted of a courtyard some 141 feet by 105 feet surrounded by pillared cloisters, three aisles deep."

² Percy Brown, op.cit., p.12. H.Sharp, Delhi, p.41.

³ Āthār ul-Sanādīd, p.67. Sir Sayyid rightly says that the Qutb Minār was constructed to be used by the mu'ezzin for making his call to prayer. Percy Brown, op.cit., p.11, says that its primary object was to proclaim to the whole world the prestige and authority of Islām; Delhi, Sharp says, p.45, "opinion inclines to the view that it was the pillar of victory ... but ... one of the inscriptions on the building and some lines of the poet Amir Khusrau would appear to indicate that it was in fact the minaret of the mosque (Quwwat ul Islām) and used by the mu'ezzin."

⁴ T.N., ed. Chughtai, p.59.

buildings and palaces, but also in works of public utility.

Ghiyāth ud-Dīn 'Iwāḍ Khaljī had built a great embankment between Lakhnautī and Lakhnau, and on another side up until Diwkot, a distance of ten days journey, to render the roads passable during the monsoon, when the area would remain inundated.¹ When Tāj ud-Dīn Sanjar Gazlak Khān assumed charge of Uchch, he established charitable foundations, works of public utility, and also exerted himself to secure tranquility for the peasantry and happiness for all the people.²

The strong architectural instincts of the Turks have been complimented by almost all scholars. Sharp says, "If we judge from their earliest efforts, the Turks were by nature great builders, endowed with large architectonic ideas."³ Elphinstone observes, "the progress of the Mussulmans may be judged by the specimens they have left of their architecture. The arches of the unfinished mosque (Quwwat ul Islām) near the Qutb Minar, besides their height and the rich ornamental inscriptions with which they are covered deserve mention as early instances of the pointed arch."⁴

Almost all the architectural works of this period have perished, but whatever traces still remain bear ample testimony to the architectural ability of the Turks.

¹ T.N., ed. pp.162-3. Minhāj says 'When Iletmish noticed the public utility works of Ghiyāth ud-Dīn 'Iwāḍ, he observed that it would not be unfair to call such a person a Sultan.'

² Ibid., p.233.

³ Delhi, p.21.

⁴ M.Elphinstone, History of India, p.491. J.Fergusson, History of Indian and Eastern Architecture, p.499, says "A nation of soldiers equipped for conquest and that only, they of course brought with them neither artists nor architects, but like all nations of Twānian origin, they had strong architectural instincts, and having a style of their own, they could hardly go wrong in any architectural project they might attempt". E.B.Havell, Indian Architecture, p.31. Havell assumes that most of the craftsmen were

CONCLUSION

It was from the time of Maḥmūd (998-1030 A.D.) that the exploitation of India entered into the plans of the Muslim invaders.¹ The third attack on India, led by the Ghori chief Mu'izz al-Dīn, had a more profound effect on the history of India than the first two. Regarding the Arab invasion of Sind, Sir Wolseley Haig writes "It was a mere episode in the history of India and affected only a small portion of the fringe of that vast country."² Maḥmūd's repeated incursions into northern India resulted in the annexation of the Punjāb in the later years of his reign, which was intended to serve as a base for further operations against India and, also, to act as a buffer in the event of a counter-attack on Ghazna.³

The Sultān himself resided at Ghazna, while his representative governed the Punjāb on his behalf. Both the Ghaznavid representatives, Ariyāruq and Ahmed Ināltigīn, during the reign

1 C.E. Bosworth, The Ghaznavids, p.235

2 Sir Wolseley Haig, op.cit., p.10.

3 Jaipal's invasion in the reign of Maḥmūd's father, Sebuktigīn, seems to have necessitated this precautionary arrangement.

of Mas'ūd were suspected of throwing off the yoke of Ghazna.¹ LanePoole's observation is beyond dispute, "A capable Turkish amīr who had witnessed the successful rise of other Turks in Asia was likely to be tempted to convert his distant province into a kingdom."² Ariyāruq was lured to Ghazna and when under the influence of heavy drinks he entered into the Court, was arrested and done away with. The pretensions of Ināltigin received a deadly blow at the hands of Tilak in 1033-34 A.D.³

Mu'izz al-Dīn was fortunate, as Qutb ud-Dīn Aybek, his representative in India was sincere and loyal to him. He conquered territories and administered them on behalf of his royal patron. After the death of Mu'izz al-Dīn, Qutb ud-Dīn did not conquer any new territories. After his death in 1210 A.D., confusion prevailed and nobles such as Arām Shah, Iletmish, Nāsir ud-Dīn Qubācha and 'Alī Mardān each carved out a kingdom for himself; the Hindūs in turn were, also, not found to be slow in recovering some of their territories, including Ranthambor, Gwāliyūr, Mandwar, Jalor and Thangīr. By 1227 A.D., Iletmish had recaptured all of these regions and in 1235 A.D., a year before his death, he even made new accessions to the Delhi Sultānate by conquering Mālwah, Bhīlsa and Ujjain.⁴

1 Tarikh-i Baihagi, pp. 221, 404; After Ahmed Hasan had lured Ariyāruq to Ghazna, he told the Amīr to keep Ariyāruq out of India if it were to be retained.

2 S. LanePoole, Medieval India, p. 35

3 Tarikh-i-Baihagi, pp. 229, 433

4 T.N., pp. 172, 174, 176.

Iletmish had purchased a number of slaves for his own protection, hoping also that they would support his dynastic rule; but instead it was they who within a period of thirty years brought about ^{the} extinction of his dynasty. Elphinstone writes, "At the death of Iletmish the contest with the Hindūs was at an end, and the period which followed was occupied by a succession of plots, mutinies and revolutions, equally destitute of present interest and permanent effects."¹

After the death of Iletmish the Muslim empire shrank in its dimensions. Taking advantage of the political disorder in the Delhi Sultanate, Vagbhata wrested Ranthambor from Muslim control.² Dissension among the nobles, which sometimes led to hostilities, made reconquest of lost territories a remote possibility. As the rift among the nobles widened, the Mongol threat increased, paralleled by that of the Hindūs. During the reign of Iletmish, in 1221 A.D., the Mongols in pursuit of Jalāl ud-Dīn Khwārazm Shāh could not advance beyond the Indus, but in 1241 A.D., after Rādīya and Mu'izz ud-Dīn had exhausted the energies of the empire in fighting for the throne and the nobles had taken their respective sides, the Mongols found

1 M. Elphinstone, History of India, p.375.

2 R.R. Halder, Epigraphia Indica, 1927-28, Vol. XIX, p.47. 'Inscription of the time of Hammir of Ranthambor dated (V.S.) 1345.'

their opportunity to attack Lahore and subject it to sack and plunder; whatever remained to complete its destruction was¹ done by the Hindūs after the Mongols had left.

Balban did not appreciate that it was the disunity among his own people that was at the basis of these troubles, and from 1241 A.D. to 1260 A.D., he was so dispirited by the Mongol incursions that he decided on the policy of making plundering raids into the territory of the Hindūs in order to² mobilise resources for meeting further Mongol attacks.

The rivalry among the nobles did not even deter them from imperilling the security of the Delhi Sultanate. The discontented among them, like Shīr Khān Sunqur, who had stoutly defended the frontiers of the Sultanate against the Mongols, and Jalāl ud-Dīn, the son of Iletmish, did not scruple to take refuge in the Mongol³ Court at Turkestan. Most unfortunate was the conduct of 'Izz ud-Dīn Balban Kashlū Khān, who not only transferred his allegiance to the Mongols, but also, in 1257 A.D., conspired with other nobles to overthrow Nāṣir ud-Dīn Maḥmūd with Mongol help. The Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica informs us that in the year

1 T.N., pp. 171, 393-395.

2 T.N., p.291.

3 Ibid, pp. 277, 272-273; 'Aziz Ahmad, Islamic culture in the Indian environment, p.13; 'Abdullah Wassaf, Tarikh-i Wassaf, B.M. 23,517, f 254a.

1257 A.D., the Mongols appeared before Multān and Shaikh Bahā ud-Dīn Zakarīya, a Muslim divine, was obliged to purchase the safety of the city by paying one hundred thousand ¹ dīnārs.

Luckily 'Izz ud-Dīn Balban's plan did not succeed; its consequences would have been disastrous in that the sovereignty ² of Delhi would have passed over to the Mongols. Contrary to the practice of other Muslim states, the acts of these nobles were condoned, and some were even rewarded by being given extensive ³ iqta's. In the reign of 'Alā ud-Dīn Mas'ūd, Ikhṭiyār ud-Dīn Yuzbak rebelled against the Court but was pardoned on the recommendation of Ghiyāth ud-Dīn Balban. A second time he behaved in a refractory manner, but was simply reduced to obedience and after some time was entrusted with the charge of Awadh. Like a born rebel, he finally threw off the yoke of Delhi and proclaimed himself king at Awadh, under the style of Sultān Mughith ud-Dīn. His reckless career came to an end during the Kāmrup expedition, when he was taken prisoner and he is believed to have died of ⁴ heart failure in the presence of its ruler.

1 M.H. Quraishī, 'Multān - Its brief history and Persian and Arabic inscriptions' Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica, 1927-28, p.4

2 ~~William F. Skene~~ William F. Skene, History of India under Baber and Humāyūn, Vol.I, pp.418, 420. In 1524 A.D., when Sultān Ibrahim Lodi sent an army against Daulat Khan Lodi, the governor of Lāhore, who had been suspected of rebellion, the latter sought the assistance of Babar, who came of the same Mongol stock, and in return promised to recognize him as his overlord. Babar readily responded to the invitation and succeeded in defeating the Imperial army under Behar Khan, but instead of restoring Lāhore to Daulat Khan he himself took possession of it.

3 T.N., p.278; In 1260 A.D., Shīr Khan Sunqur was assigned a large territory as his iqta', comprising Kol, Bayana, Balaram, Jalisar, Mehr, Mahawan and the fortress of Gwaliyur.

4 Ibid, pp. 262-265.

Evidence exists that all nobles were not anxious to occupy the throne. The fact that a sovereign stood the risk of losing his life, as was not uncommon with the unfortunate successors of Iletmish, explains the attitude. Bughra Khan, the son of Balban, refused the throne of Delhi and preferred the governorship of Lakhnauti. Two rulers of the Tughlaq dynasty, Ghiyath ud-Din Tughlaq and Firuz Tughlaq, were initially reluctant to accept the throne. The contemporary accounts¹ tell us that they subsequently yielded to the pressure of the nobles. About Ghiyath ud-Din Tughlaq, Sir Wolseley Haig says, "After a decent profession of reluctance he was proclaimed king on September 8, (1320 A.D.), under the title of Ghiyath ud-Din Tughlaq Shah". As it would appear, 'Izz ud-Din Balban Kashu Khan and Ghiyath ud-Din Balban were the only nobles who never disguised their thirst for sovereignty.

While the acts of the nobles had tended to weaken the sovereign power, their relations with the peasantry and the common man were rather better. The appointment of Hindūs for assessment and collection of revenue, and a policy of non-interference with their traditional customs went far to securing³ an attitude of harmony. Except in Mewat, when the security

1 Barani, pp.121-122, 421-423, 535-536; Barani says, however much Firuz would decline kingship, the elders were determined not to accept any refusal from him.

2 Sir Wolseley Haig, op.cit. p.126.

3 Tara Chand, Influence of Islam on Indian Culture, p.137.

of the Sultanate was in danger due to Mongol depredations, there is no evidence of any local uprising, neither was revenue ever withheld. The great wealth of India had made the nobles extremely debauched. A picture of their dissipated life is thus presented by Baranī. "Seekers of pleasures, convivialists, sensualists, purveyors of wits, and clowns, who (during the reign of Balban) had disappeared, and had remained unemployed in the corner of abasement and were without a customer, came into demand with the accession of Mu'izz ud-Dīn Kaiqubād. Beautiful damsels re-appeared in the shadow of every wall, and handsome figures came into display on each balcony. Master of melodies and chanter of odes were to be found in every lane. In every quarter a singer and a composer of melody lifted his head. The time became ripe for the debauched and the seekers of romance. Fortune smiled on the parasites and the courtiers; prosperity extended its welcome to the jesters and buffoons. The star of musicians, lovely damsels, and the moon-faced ones was in its ascendancy. Sultān Mu'izz ud-Dīn Kaiqubād, his nobles, the sons of his khāns and maliks, the gay, the rich, the sensualists, and the epicures, one and all gave themselves up to pleasure and merriment, and the hearts of the notables and the common men of the realm became inclined to wine, sweet-¹ hearts, musicians and clowns."

1 Baranī, pp. 129-130; Cf Amīr Khusrau, Wast ul Hayāt, I.O.1457, f 28b, Khusrau is elated that wine-drinking is given up in the month of Ramdan.

The irruption of the Mongols in Central Asia had driven the learned men from their homes, many of whom found refuge in the Court of Delhi. Some were absorbed in to the administration while others were appointed as teachers in madrassahs. Titus writes, "in their new found home they successfully established the tradition of scholarship, which had made the¹ Muslim schools of the west, whence they had come, so famous". The presence of these learned men made the Sultanate the cultural centre of the East. But the Turkish amirs, in the reign of Rukn-ud-Dīn, killed a number of them just to preserve their political² supremacy. The conception of a regular administrative or judicial system had no existence for the nobles. In the reign of Balban after the overthrow of the Caliphate of Baghdad by Hulāgū in 1258 A.D. the Delhi Sultanate became a magnet for foreign luminaries of whose company Baranī says, the Sultān³ was extremely fond.

It is generally agreed that the early conversion in India was largely the work of those missionaries who either came independently or followed in the wake of the conquering army. Arnold is of opinion that force played no significant part in conversion,

1 M.T. Titus, Indian Islam, p.77

2 T.N., p.173.

3 Baranī, p.46; Cf Tārīkh-i-Firishṭa, Vol.I, pp.131, 132.

rather it was the effect of the teachings and persuasion of peaceful missionaries.

The offer of Islam usually made to the Hindūs before an attack, no doubt was sometimes responded to, but on the whole the effect was short-lived and ceased to be effective after the retreat of the invaders.¹ The most famous "missionary" of the thirteenth century was Khawaja Mu'in ud-Din Chishti, who came and settled at Ajmīr. About him, Arnold says that he exercised great influence over the Hindus, so much so, that while he was on his way to Ajmīr he succeeded in converting some seven hundred persons at Delhi. Another missionary, Bū 'Alī Qalandar, according to Arnold, in late 13th century converted one Amīr Singh at Panipat, whose three hundred Muslim Rājput descendants testify to the conversion at the hands of the saint.²

It is doubtful if the nobles had made substantial provision for the maintenance of missionaries who were hardly men of means. On the authority of Akhbār ul Akhīyār we know that Qutb ud-Dīn Bakhtiyār Kākī, after whom the Qutb Minār is named and who was a disciple of Khawaja Mu'in ud-Din Chishti,

1 T.W. Arnold, Preachings of Islām, pp. 208-210 (edition 1896). This statement is deleted from later editions.

2 Ibid, pp. 281-282 (1913 edition).

1

used to subsist on loans. Titus writes, "Usually they have been individuals endowed with piety and religious zeal, frequently men of learning, who through their own personal interest in the spread of Islām, and inspired with a divine call, have been content to wander from place to place and gather disciples".²

By far the most important factor which attracted the Hindūs to Islām, were the benefits which would follow conversion. According to LanePoole, "the moment an Indian accepts Islām he enters a brotherhood which admits of no distinction of class in the sight of God, and every advancement in office, and rank and marriage is open to him".³

The majority of them entered the fold of Islam of their own free will. It is not unlikely that when someone became a Muslim, he persuaded other members of the family to follow his example. Arnold says that besides missionaries, Muslim men and women of all ranks tried to convert people to their own faith". He writes, "In a list of Indian missionaries published in Anjuman-i-Himāyat-i-Islām kā māhwārī risālah (Lahore, Oct. 1889, pp. 5-13)

1 Akhbār ul Akhīyār, Urdu Translation by Iqbāl ud-Dīn Ahmad, p.55.

2 M.T. Titus, Indian Islam, pp.42, 43; Titus says that Syed Ahmad Kabir, known as Makhdum-i-Jahāniyān, had converted many tribes in the Punjab. He quotes no authority for his information.

3 S. LanePoole, Medieval India, p.62.

we find the names of schoolmasters, government clerks in the canal and opium department, traders including a dealer in camel carts, an editor of a newspaper, a book-binder and a workman in a printing establishment. These men devote the hours of leisure left them after the completion of the day's labour, to the preaching of their religion in the streets and bāzars of Indian cities, seeking to win converts both from Christians and Hindūs whose religious beliefs they controvert¹ and attack".

With the passage of time harmony increased between the two communities; the seed of which had been sown in the time of Maḥmūd when he began employing Hindūs in his army. On the appointment of Tilak who was the son of a barber, as Mas'ud's commander in chief against Ināltigīn, Lane²boole observes, "the fact that a Hindū should have attained such a position shows how far the process of assimilation between the Turks and the Indians had already gone".

The intercourse between the Hindūs and Muslims after the Ghaznavid invasion of India, led to the growth of a new language called Urdu. The difficulties which the Persian-

1 T.W. Arnold, Preachings of Islām, p.333 (edition 1896).

2 S. Lane^aboole, Medieval India, p.42.

speaking foreigners and the local people faced in their mutual dealings, for want of a common medium of expression, was¹ obviously the motive force in its evolution. Dr. Sādiq attributes the beginning of Urdu to the patronage of the Bahmanī dynasty (1347-1526 A.D.), the first independent Muslim rulers in the South. He says, "It may be surmised that when they broke away from the tutelage of the north, the Bahmanids discarded, like all newly emancipated people, the forms and conventions of the north, and remained intent on developing their own culture, and although they had strong affiliations with Persian, the cultural language of the Mussulmans in India, they decided, nevertheless, to cultivate their own language in preference to it".² Dr. Sādiq's theory cannot be entirely accepted. It is true that the language received encouragement at the Bahmanī court, which led to its advancement, but its development-process may be traced to the 13th century in the works of Amīr Khusrāu. His Dībācha-i Ghurrat ul Kamāl, and other Hindī (pre-Urdu) compositions may be cited as cases in point. Dr. Yusuf Husain says that several later writers have mentioned the popularity of

1 H.G. Rawlinson, A concise history of the Indian people, p.2, says that the official language of the Muhammadan invaders was Persian, but later from a combination of Persian and Hindī they evolved a new language known as Urdu, or the language of the camp.

2 Muhammad Sādiq, A history of Urdu literature, p.44

Khusrau's Hindī poetry in their works. Khusrau calls himself an Indian Turk who is ignorant of Arabic, but is nevertheless capable of answering fluently anything that is asked in Hindī.¹ He was an ardent protagonist of the language and possessed a keen desire to accord it an acknowledged status. Ja'ffar has very rightly analysed the circumstances which brought the language into existence. For Urdu "the soil was prepared and the seeds were sown during the early Muslim period and that the harvest was reaped during the Mughal rule and the British Rāj. And what gave rise to the new language is not difficult to say. Forces such as the system of instruction, Hindūs and Muslims studying together in the same schools, without any restrictions of race, rank or religion - compulsory education in Persian; translation of Sanskrit and Hindī books into Persian; mutual exchange, adoption and incorporation of words, thoughts and ideas; Hindu-Muslim social intercourse, combined and collectively created Urdu, which in course of time, superseded its parents - Persian and Hindī - and became the lingua franca of northern India".²

1 Yūsuf Husain, Medieval Indian culture, p.105; Sayyid Ahmad Khan, Āthār us sanādīd, pp. 204-212

2 S.M. Ja'ffar, Education in Muslim India, pp.216-217

APPENDIX 'A'

Amīr Ruhānī's Verses on the Conquest of Ranthambor and Siwalik

Amīr Ruhānī, an illustrious literary figure who had migrated from Bukhārā to Delhī after the catastrophe of Chengīz Khān, wrote the following verses when Iletmish conquered Ranthambor and the Siwalik territories.¹

خبر به اهل سعاد^۱ برد جبرئیل امین
ز فتح نامه سلطان عهد شمس الدین

که اے ملائکہ قدس آسمان بریں^۲
پدین بشارت بندید کله^۱ و آئین

که از بلاد ملاحد شهنشاه اسلام
کشاد بار دگر قلعه سپهر آئین

شه مجاهد غازی که دست تهنش را
روان حیدر گزار میکند تحسین

¹ Tabaqāt-i Akbarī, Vol. I, p.61

² This misra' is corrupt.

APPENDIX 'B'

of

Rubā'ī Recording the Date of the Conquest Gwāliyūr

When Iletmish conquered Gwāliyūr, his dabīr, Taj ud-Dīn Reza composed the following rubā'ī, which was carved on a stone on the gate of the fort. It gives the year of the conquest. 1

هر قلعه که سلطان سلطین گرفت
از عون خدا و حضرت دین گرفت
آن قلعه گوالیارو آن حصین حصین
در ستایش سده ثلاثین گرفت

~~xxSee next page~~

1. Tabaqat-i Akbari, Vol. I, pp. 59-60

APPENDIX 'C'Cultural prosperity during the reign of Iletmish

The following extract from 'Iṣāmī's Futūh us salātin, describes the cultural richness of the Delhi Sultanate during the reign of Iletmish.¹

رسیدند درویش ملک عرب	بسے سیدان صحیح السب
بسے نقشبندان اقلیم چین	بسے کاسبان خراسان زمین
بسے زاهد و عابد از هر بلاد	بسے عالمان بخارا و زاد
ز هر شهر هر اصل سیمین بران	ز هر ملک هر جنس صنعت گران
جواهر فروشان برون از قیاس	بسے ناطقان جواهر شفا بس
بسے اهل دانش ز هر مرز و بوم	حکیمان یونان طیبان روم
چون پروانه بر نور شمع آمدند	در آن شهر فرخنده جمع آمدند
دیارش همه دار اسلم شد	یکے کعبه هفت اقلیم شد
رسانید رایات دین را به ماه	شعیدم که بقای آن تختگاه

[†] ~~xxxxxx~~ page.
See next page.

¹ Futuh us salatin, pp. 109 - 110.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1 PERSIAN MANUSCRIPTS

Abū 'Umar Minhāj ud-Dīn Uthmān ibn-i Sirāj ud-Dīn al-Juzjānī, Tabagāt-i Nasirī, (Rieu I, Add.26,189)

Ahmad bin Muhammad al-qādī, Nusakh-i Jahān-āra (Rieu I, Or.141)

Baranī, Diyā ud-Dīn, Tārīkh-i Firūz shāhī, (Rieu III, Or.2039)

Fakhr-i Mudabbir Mubārakshāh, Ādāb al-mulūk wa kifāyat al-mamlūk, I.O.647 (Ethe 2767)

Fakhr-i Mudabbir Mubārakshāh, Ādāb ul harb wa shujā'at (Rieu II, Add.16, 853)

Hasan Nizāmī, Tāj ul ma'āthir, I.O. 1486 (Ethe 209)

Khān, Amīn ud-Dīn, Muntakhab az kitāb-i ma'lūmāt ul-Āfāq, (Rieu III, Or.1741)

Khusrau, Amīr, 'Ashīqa (Rieu II, Or.335)

Khusrau, Amīr, Wast ul hayāt, I.O. 1457 (Ethe 1191)

Khwand Amīr, Habīb us siyar, Vol.II, (Rieu I, Add.27,237)

Shaikh 'Abd ul Haqq bin Saif ud-Dīn Dehlawī, Tārīkh-i Haqqī, (Rieu I, Add.26,210)

Sultān Firūz Shāh, Futūhāt-i Firūzshāhī, (Rieu III, Or.2039)

Wassaf, 'Abd ullāh, Tārīkh-i Wassāf (Rieu I, Add.23,517)

2 PUBLISHED PRIMARY WORKS

Abū 'Umar Minhāj ud-Dīn Uthmān ibn-i Sirāj ud-Dīn al-Juzjānī, Tabagāt-i Nasirī, ed. Nassau Lees, Khadim Hussain, and 'Abdul Hayy (Bib. Indica, Calcutta, 1864)

Idem, ed. M.A. Chughtai (Lahore, 1952)

Idem, (English) Translation of Tabagāt-i Nasirī by H.G. Raverty, 2 Vols. (London 1881-1899)

Abul Fadl, Ā'in-i Akbari, Vols. 1,2 (Lucknow, 1869)

- 'Afif, Shams Sirāj-i, Tārīkh-i Firūz shāhī, ed. Maulavī Vilāyat Hussain (Bib. Indica, Calcutta, 1891)
- Idem, Urdu translation by Maulavī Fidā 'Alī (Karāchi, 1963)
- Ahmad, Khawājah Nizām ud-Dīn, Tabagāt-i Akbarī, 3 Vols, ed. B. De and Hidayat Hussain (Bib. Indica, Calcutta, 1927-35)
- Ahmad, Shihāb ud-Dīn Abul 'Abbās bin 'Alī bin Abī Ghudda al-Qalqashandī, Subh ul a'shā fi sinā'at il-inshā (portions relating to India translated by Otto Spies as An Arab account of India in the fourteenth century, Stuttgart 1936)
- Al-Birunī, Kitāb ul Hind, translated into English as Al-birunī's India by E. C. Sachau, 2 Vols (London 1910)
- Al-Māwardī, Abul Hasan 'Alī al-Baghdādī, Al-ahkām us-Sultānīyah Urdu translation by Sayyid Muhammad Ibrahim (Karāchi, 1965)
- 'Alī, Mrs Meer Hasan, Observations on the Mussulmāns of India, 2 Vols. (London 1832)
- Amīr Hasan 'Alā Sanjarī, Fawā'id ul fawā'id, Urdu translation by Malik Faqī ud-Dīn Naqshbandī, (Karāchi n.d.)
- Anon. Hudūd al-'ālam, translated by V. Minorsky (G.M.S., London, 1937)
- Anon, Tadhkirat al-muluk, translated by V. Minorsky (G.M.S., London, 1943)
- Badāyūnī, 'Abdul Qādīr, Muntakhab ut-tawārīkh, ed. Maulavi Ahmad 'Alī, 3 Vols. (Bib. Indica, Calcutta, 1869)
- Baihaqī, A. F., Tārīkh-i Baihaqī, ed. Q. Ghānī and 'A. A. Fayyāq (Tehran, 1945)
- Baranī, Diyā ud-Dīn, Tārīkh-i Firūz shāhī, ed. Sayyid Ahmad Khān (Bib. Indica, Calcutta, 1862)
- Barbosa, Duarte, The book of Duarte Barbosa, 2 vols., Translated and edited by M. L. Dames (Hakluyt Society, London 1918-21)

Bernier, F., Travels in the Mogul Empire, ed. A. Constable, (Westminster, 1891)

Dughlāt, Mirzā Muhammad Haider, Tārīkh-i Rashīdī, translated into English by Sir E Dennison Ross and edited by N. Elias (London, 1895)

Elliot, Sir H.M., and Dowson, J., The history of India as told by its own historians, Vols. II, III (London 1869, 1872); Vol. II, second edition, ed. M. Habib ('Alīgarh 1952)

Fakhr-i Mudabbir Mubārakshāh, Tārīkh-i Fakhr ud-Dīn Mubārak Shāh, ed. from a unique manuscript by E. Dennison Ross (London, 1927)

Firishta, Muhammad Hindū Shāh, Gulshan-i Ibrāhīmī also known as Tārīkh-i Firishta, ^{2 Vols.} (Bombay, 1832)

Idem, translated into English as History of the rise of the Muhammadan power in India till 1612 A.D. by J. Briggs, 4 Vols. (London, 1829)

Ibn Battūta, Tuhfat un muzzār fi gharāib il-amsār wa'ajā'ib il-astār, 'Abridged English translation as Travels in Asia and Africa, 1325-54 by H.A.R. Gibb (Broadway Travellers, London, 1939); Urdu translation as Safarnāma-i Ibn Battūta by Ra'is Ahmad Ja'farī (Karāchī, 1961)

Ibn Khaldūn, The Muqaddimah, translated into English by F. Rosenthal in three volumes (London, 1958); Urdu translation by Sa'd Hasan Khān Yusufī (Karāchī, n.d.)

'Isāmī, Futuh us Salātīn, ed. Āghā Mehdī Hussain (Agra, 1938)

Juwaynī, 'Alā ud-Dīn 'Alā Malik, Tārīkh-i Jahān-gusha, ed. Muhammad Qzawīnī, 3 vols. (G.M.S. London and Leyden, 1912-37); English translation by J.A. Boyle as History of the world-conqueror, 2 vols. (Manchester, 1958)

Kai Kā'us bin Iskandar, Qabūs-nāma, ed. R. Levy (G.M.S., London, 1951); translated into English as A mirror for princes by R. Levy, (London, 1951)

Khusrau, Amīr, Ḥāz-i khusravī, 5 vols. (Lucknow, 1876)

Idem, Matla' ul anwār (Lucknow, 1885)

Idem, Qirān us sa'dain, ed. Maulavī Quḍrat Aḥmad (Lucknow, 1885)

- Idem, Nuh siphir, ed. M. Wahid Mirza (Calcutta, 1948)
- Idem, Khazā'in ul futūh, ed. M. Wahid Mirza (Calcutta, 1953)
- Major, R.H. (ed.), India in the fifteenth century, (Hakluyt society London 1857)
- Manucci, N., Storia do Mogor, translated by W. Irvine, 4 Vols. (London, 1906-1908)
- Mir Khwand, Raudat us-safa, ed. Ridā Qulī Khān (Tehran, 1853-6)
- Ma'sum, Muhammad, A history of Sind, translated into English by G.G. Malet (Bombay, 1855)
- Nizami, 'Arudi Samarqandi, Chahar magala, ed. Qazwini and M Mu'ti (Tehran, 1954), revised, translated E.G. Browne, (G.M.S., London, 1921)
- Nizam ud-Din, M., Introduction to the Jawami' ul-Hikayat of Muhammad 'Awfi (G.M.S., London, 1929)
- Nizam ul-mulk, Abu 'Ali Hasan ibn-i 'Ali Tusi, Siyasatnama, ed. Muhammad Qazwini (Tehran, 1956)
- Idem, English translation by Hubert Darke (London, 1960); Urdu translation by Shah Hasan 'Ala (Karachi, n.d.)
- Qur'an, translated and annotated by Maulavi Muhammad 'Ali, (Lahore, 1920)
- Rawandi, Rahat us-sudur wa avat us-surur, ed. M. Iqbal (G.M.S., London, 1921)
- Sarkar, Sir J.N., The India of Aurangzib, translation and annotation from extracts of the Khulasat ut-tawarikh and the Chahar gulshan (Calcutta, 1901)
- Shaiikh 'Abdul Haqq Muhaddith Dehlavi, Akhbar ul-akhbar, Urdu translation by Mawlana Iqbal ud Din Ahmad (Karachi, 1983)
- Tavernier, J.B., Travels in India², 2 vols., translated by V. Ball, ed. William Crooke (Oxford, 1925)
- Yahya bin Ahmad bin 'Abdullah Sirhindi, Tarikh-i Mubarakshahi, ed. Maulavi Hidayat Hussain (Calcutta, 1931); English translation by K.K. Basu, (Gaekwad oriental series, Baroda, 1932)

3 SECONDARY SOURCES

a) Texts

- Ahmad, A., Islamic culture in the Indian environment (Oxford, 1964)
- Ahmad, Sir Sayyid, Qadīm nizām-i dehī-i Hindūstān (Aligarh, 1878)
- 'Alī, A.Y., Medieval India (Oxford, 1932)
- 'Alī, M.A., The Mughal nobility under Aurangzib (London, 1966)
- Arberry, A.J., Kings and Beggars, being the translation of the first two chapters of Sa'dī's Gulistān (London 1945)
- Archer, William, India and the future (London 1917)
- Arnold, Sir T.W., Preaching of Islām (London 1896, second edition, 1913)
- Idem, The Caliphate (Oxford, 1924)
- Ashraf, K.M., Life and conditions of the people of Hindūstān, 1200-1550 (published in the Journal and proceedings of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, third series, Vol.I, 1935, Calcutta, 1936)
- Bakhsh, S. Khudā, Studies Indian and Islamic (London, 1927)
- Barthold, W., Turkestan down to the Mongol invasion² (G.M.S., London, 1928)
- Bosworth, C.E., The Ghaznavids, their empire in Afghānistān and eastern Iran, 994-1040 (Edinburgh, 1963)
- Brown, Percy, Indian architecture⁴, Islamic period (Bombay, 1964)
- Dunbar, Sir George, Bt. A history of India (London, 1939)
- Elphinstone, M., The history of India (London, 1899)
- Erskine, W., History of India under Baber and Humāyūn, 2 Vols. (London, 1854)
- Fergusson, J., History of Indian and eastern architecture (London 1899)
- Ghoshāl, U.N., Agrarian system in ancient India (Calcutta, 1930)
- Habib, M. and Mrs Afsar'Umar Salim Khān, The political theory of the Delhi Sultanate (New Delhi, n.d.)

- Habīb u'llāh, A.B.M., The foundation of Muslim rule in India,
(Allahabad 1961)
- Haig, Sir T.W. (ed.) Cambridge history of India, Vol.III.
(Cambridge, 1928)
- Havell, E.B., Indian architecture (London 1913)
- Idem, The history of Aryan rule in India from the earliest times to
the death of Akbar (London 1918)
- Idem, A short history of India (London, 1924)
- Hodivala, S.H., Studies in Indo-Muslim history: a critical commentary
on Elliot and Dowson's "History of India as told by its own
historians" (Bombay 1939)
- Howorth, H.H., History of Mongols, 4 parts (London 1876)
- Huart, C., Ancient Persia and Iranian civilization, translated by
M.R.Doble (London 1927)
- Husain, A.M., The rise and fall of Muhammad bin Tughlaq (London 1938)
- Husain, Yūsuf, Glimpses of medieval Indian culture (Bombay, 1959)
- Hunter, Sir W.W., The Indian empire (London 1882)
- Ikrām, S.M., Āh-i Kawthar (Lāhore, 1965)
- Idem, History of Muslim Civilization of India and Pakistan (Lāhore, n.d.)
- Ja'ffar, S.M., Education in Muslim India (Lahore, 1936)
- Kabīr, M., The Buwayhid dynasty of Baghdād (Calcutta, 1964)
- Keay, F.E., Indian education in ancient and later times (Oxford, 1938)
- Kremer, Von, Culturgeschichte des Orients, translated by S. Khuda
Bakhsh as The Orient under the Caliphs (Calcutta, 1929)
- Lambton, A.K.S., Landlord and peasant in Persia (London 1953)
- Lane-Poole, S., Mediaeval India under Muhammadan rule (London, 1903)
- Idem, The Muhammadan dynasties (London, 1894)

- Law, N.N., Promotion of learning in India (London 1916)
- (The) legacy of Islām, ed. Sir T.W. Arnold and Alfred Gillaume (Oxford 1931)
- Levy, R., The social structure of Islām³ (Cambridge, 1965)
- (The) Macdonald presentation volume (New Jersey, 1933)
- Margoliouth, D.S., The early development of Muhammadanism (London, 1914)
- Mazumdar, B.P., The socio-economic history of northern India, (Calcutta, 1960)
- Mez, A., The renaissance of Islām, translated by S. Khudā Bakhsh and D.S. Margoliouth (London 1937)
- Miller, B., The Palace-school of Muhammad the conqueror (Cambridge, 1941)
- Moreland, W.H., The Agrarian system of Muslim India (Cambridge, 1929)
- Muir, Sir W., The mameluke or slave dynasty of Egypt. 1260-1517 A.D. (London 1896)
- Muir, Sir W., The Caliphate, rise, decline and fall, ed. T.H. Weir, (Edinburgh, 1915)
- Mulla, Rt. Hon'ble Sir D.F., Principles of Muhammadan Law (Calcutta 1944)
- Nāzim, M., The life and times of Sultan Mahmūd of Ghazna (Cambridge 1931)
- Nieboer, J.H., Slavery as an industrial system² (The Hague, 1910)
- Nizāmī, K.A., Some aspects of religion and politics in India during the thirteenth century (Bombay, 1961)
- Pandey, A.B., Society and government in medieval India, (Allahabad, 1965)
- Prasad, Ishwarī, History of medieval India, (Allahabad, 1928)
- Qureshī, I.H., The Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi (Lāhore, 1942)

- Rawlinson, H.G., A concise history of the Indian people (Oxford, 1946)
- Rawlinson, G., Ancient monarchies - the five great monarchies of the ancient eastern world, 4 Vols. (London, 1867)
- Idem, The seventh great oriental monarchy (London, 1876)
- Roberts, R., Social laws of the Qur'ān (London, 1925)
- Sādiq, M., A history of Urdu literature (London, 1964)
- Saran, P., Studies in medieval Indian history (Delhī, 1952)
- Sarkār, B.K., Inland transport and communication in medieval India, (Calcutta, 1925)
- Sarkār, Sir J.N., Mughal administration² (Calcutta, 1924)
- Idem, (ed.) History of Bengal, Vol. II. Dacca, 1948)
- Sharma, S.R., The crescent in India (Bombay, 1954)
- Sharp, H., Delhī (Oxford, 1921)
- Smith, Adam, The wealth of nations, 2 Vols. (Everyman's library edition, London 1954)
- Smith, V.A., Oxford history of India (Oxford, 1919 and second edition, 1923)
- Sykes, Sir Percy, A history of Persia³, 2 Vols. (London 1930)
- Tārāchānd, Influence of Islam on Indian culture (Allahabad, 1963)
- Thomas, B., The Arabs (London, 1937)
- Thomas, F.W., Mutual influences of Muhammadans and Hindūs in India, (Cambridge, 1892)
- Titus, M.T., Indian Islām (Oxford, 1930)
- Tripathī, R.P., Some aspects of Muslim administration (Allahabad 1936)
- Watt, Professor W.M., Islamic philosophy and theology (Edinburgh, 1962)

Idem, Muhammad at Medina (Oxford 1962)

Wright, H.N., The Sultāns of Delhi, their coinage and metrology,
(Delhi, 1936)

Zaydān, J., Umayyads and 'Abbāsids, translated by D.S. Margoliouth
(G.M.S. Leyden, 1907)

b) Epigraphy, Journals and Gazetteers

Āthar us-sanādīd, by Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khān, ed. M. Haq (Pakistan
Historical Society, Karachi, 1966)

Epigraphia Indica

Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica

Imperial Gazetteer of India

Indian Historical Quarterly, Calcutta

Islamic Culture, Hyderabad - Deccan

Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, London

Journal of Indian History, Madras

c) Books of reference

Encyclopaedia of Islām

Hobson-Jobson by H. Yule and A. C. Burnell (London, 1903)

